

THE  
**SATURDAY REVIEW**  
OF  
**POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.**

No. 891, Vol. 34.

November 23, 1872.

[Registered for  
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

**PRUSSIA AND GERMANY.**

THE Lower House of the Prussian Parliament has wisely decided to adopt the suggestions of the Government, and without further discussion to pass the new County Reform Bill in the shape in which it has now been drawn up. The Ministry took two of the leaders of the Liberal majority into their confidence, and the slight changes necessary to give the Upper House an excuse for reconsidering its vote were quietly agreed on. The only alteration of any importance is that something more of their old police jurisdiction is still to be retained by the feudal proprietors than was at first intended. But the whole framework of the Bill is the same, and the determination of the Government to carry it remains unshaken, although the Ministry very properly declined to explain to the Lower House the precise measures which they are prepared to adopt in order to bend the Peers to their will. If the measure can be carried without any definite threats of what will happen in case the Peers remain obstinate, so much the better; and it would have been a needless insult to the Peers if the process by which they are to be brought to submission had been explained elsewhere than in their own House. The Polish deputies appear to have asked how it happened that the proposed reforms were not to be extended to their districts, and they were frankly told that the reforms which in East Prussia were expected to introduce a more liberal system of administration would work in an exactly opposite direction if they were introduced into districts where those invested with new powers would be under the control of the Ultramontane clergy. At any rate there is no pretentious nonsense about the infant Liberalism of the Prussian Government. It does not appear to think that there are universal principles of government which apply equally everywhere. It wants to strengthen its hands against the party which is reactionary in religion and in politics; and it thinks that one mode of effecting its object is to breathe new life into the representative government of certain provinces. Those who will get more power there will be men anxious to secure their own local independence as against the great feudal proprietors, and men allied by education, relationship, and the ties of commerce with the Liberal inhabitants of the larger provincial towns. Such men are to be encouraged because they are likely hereafter to be the best allies of the Government in its endeavour to establish the union of Germany on a Liberal basis. To give equal advantages to men not at all inclined to assert any independence, men habitually obedient to an Ultramontane clergy, and averse both by habit and training to any modes of thought or action on which their superiors would look with suspicion, would be to sacrifice the reality to the shadow, and to frustrate the aims of a reform merely to get the credit of having carried out this reform in a consistent and logical manner.

The Bill itself is one of very mild character, and of a very narrow scope. It fixes on the county as the new unit of administration. It recognizes below the county, first communes, and then groups of communes associated for such objects as drainage and sanitary supervision which cannot be undertaken satisfactorily by any single commune. It provides that the County Assembly shall be chosen so as to give the inhabitants other than the feudal proprietors an equal share in the representation, whereas at present these feudal proprietors are virtually masters of everything. This Assembly is to choose a Council, and also a President of the Council, subject to the ratification of the Crown, and the President is to be the organ of communication between the Crown and the county. The main value of the Bill is that it gives to the organization of each county a simple character with a well-

defined gradation of authorities, while it makes the basis of government representative, and gives a fair share in the representation to the humbler classes of the population. Some of the feudal privileges of the landed proprietors are still to be retained, and it is obvious that, with the influence of rank and wealth and the prestige of centuries of unquestioned superiority, the nobles would exercise a power in the counties even after the Bill was carried which might satisfy any reasonable men. The Upper House objects to the Bill not because it would in real life deprive the nobles of much power, but because, by forcing them to acquire and use power in a new way, it would hurt the feelings of the good and gratify the aspirations of the bad—the good being those who cling to the Prussia of the past, and the bad being those who cling to the Prussia of the future. It is important to seize on these two characteristics of the Government policy in this matter, for they represent the leading principles of the policy of the Prussian Government in recent years. A reform is proposed, and on examination it is found that it is in itself a tiny reform; and in the next place there is no intention of carrying out a similar reform where it would not suit the Government to do so, merely because consistency is pressed on it. This is exactly the way in which Prussia has been going on ever since Prince BISMARCK ruled its fortunes. It is a policy to which many objections may be made, which is often marked with signs of violence and indifference to the feelings of men, and often finds expression in terms of an almost brutal frankness. But at least it is a policy which deserves to be understood; which must be regarded as a whole, and not criticized too exclusively by the test of unsatisfactory details. What Prince BISMARCK has always said to his countrymen when aspiring for liberty is that there is something for Prussia to think of before its liberty, and that is its existence. To exist it has had, under his guidance, to fight first Austria, and then France, and then the Ultramontanes. So far as liberty is compatible with, or conducive to, the assurance of the existence of Prussia he sees no obstacle to it, although, as a man bred in Junker circles, he has no great fancy for it. He now makes a tiny reform because he thinks the success of the main policy of Prussia will be aided by it; he refuses to extend this tiny reform where its extension would imperil the success of his main policy; and he is perfectly indifferent if those who are to be benefited by this reform call him a very timid Liberal, and if those to whom this reform is denied call him tyrannical and inconsistent.

All that can be said against Prince BISMARCK's policy has been summed up in an article in the last number of the *Contemporary Review*, written with much force of expression and abundance of information. Prussia under the guidance of Prince BISMARCK has, according to the writer, been the great enemy of everything good and honest in Germany. Prussia waged against Austria a war of unmitigated selfishness, thirsting only for territory and power. There is nothing like constitutional government in Prussia or in Germany so far as Prussia determines what Germany shall be. There is no Ministerial responsibility, for Prince BISMARCK is omnipotent, and accountable only to the EMPEROR. There is no freedom of the press, no security for the liberty of the subject. Those who make the most harmless political speeches are pounced upon and kept in prison without trial, or condemned after trials which are a mere mockery of justice. Taxation has increased, and an enormous hoard of bullion is stored up in pure waste against a future war. Hanover is full of disaffection, and the light-hearted people of the Rhineland cannot endure the stern children of Berlin. In the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine Prussia has but gained a new heritage of woe. The most fundamental

liberties have been violated in the punishment of clergymen for preaching political sermons, and in the persecution of the Jesuits. Such is the dark picture drawn of Prussia and Germany in the *Contemporary*, and no Englishman can affect not to lament that the blessings of freedom which we enjoy are so imperfectly shared by Germany; and if history is to be written truthfully, the policy of Prince BISMARCK must be confessed to have been often high-handed and harsh in the extreme. But the basis of the attack on Prince BISMARCK is really the assumption that Prussia and Germany could be as they are now, great and powerful and secure, at a less cost. The war with Austria is condemned as one of unmitigated selfishness; but the writer omits to inquire whether German greatness or freedom would have been possible if Austria, which was the centre of everything reactionary and oppressive, had not been driven out of the Confederation. Prussia may at least have the satisfaction of remembering that she did her conquered enemy a great amount of good, and that such constitutionalism as is known in Austria may be traced to the fortunate defeat of Sadowa. Prussia seized on Hanover and Hesse-Cassel and Frankfurt, and more recently headed Germany in the seizure of Alsace and Lorraine; and such acts can have but one justification—that they were necessary for the safety of Prussia and Germany against France. If France had been strong enough to keep Germany always divided, to play off Court against Court and one aristocratic coterie against another, this or that tiny despotism might have been of a milder character, but only tiny despotisms could have flourished under the shadow of a foreign Power. It is idle to condemn Prussia for all she has done until the question is first asked and answered, whether there could have been a free Germany, whether there could have been anything worth calling Germany at all, if Germany had remained manacled by Austria and blighted by France. What would have become of the light-hearted people of the Rhineland if they had not had the stern children of Berlin to take care of them? If it is once acknowledged that it was necessary for Germany that the power of Austria and France should be broken, then there remains nothing but the minor and subsidiary question, whether in carrying on to a successful issue two of the most arduous wars of modern history Prussia was not somewhat too severe and tyrannical. It was prophesied by many Germans that when the French war was over the Prussian Government would find itself compelled to be more Liberal than before. No one can deny that this prophecy has been partially realized. At a moment when Prince BISMARCK is quarrelling with the order to which he belongs and with the political friends of his past life, it seems absurd to contend that the Government of which he is the soul is making no approaches to the realization of what Liberals demand. But then it is objected that his Liberalism is feeble and its action arbitrary. He only reforms as far as he likes and when he likes, and he never adheres to or is governed by the great abiding principles of liberty. Again, there is a previous question to be determined. Could he do more if he is to keep always in view the first object of his policy—the maintenance of the existence of Prussia and Germany. What would happen if he were to let loose the democracy on the aristocracy, if he were to let disaffection get head in the recently annexed provinces, and if he were to allow free play to the machinations of a clergy bent on his ruin? Few foreigners can pretend to know enough of Germany to be sure that they could give a certain answer to these questions, and could pronounce decidedly that Prince BISMARCK is perversely repressing German liberty in order to fight against a set of phantoms and to secure an Empire which needs no such security.

#### MINISTERIAL DESIGNS ON COLLEGE PROPERTY.

MR. FAWCETT, at a dinner of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, lately made some remarks which may be conveniently compared with a passage in Mr. GOSCHEN's speech at Bristol. The Government which can leave nothing alone has, as Mr. FAWCETT reasonably suspected, an eye on the property of the Colleges. He had perhaps not at that time observed that Mr. GOSCHEN took occasion to denounce the exceptions to the law of mortmain which enable certain corporate bodies to hold property in land. It is not known that the tenants or any other class of the community have complained of the character or management of corporate bodies; but some theoretic reformers have thought that the land which is held in mortmain would be more easily appropriated for the purpose of their experiments than the estates of private

owners. The same sect of economists proposes eventually either to abolish property in land, or to confiscate for public purposes the natural increment of value which arises from the growth of wealth and population. Colleges and other land-owning Corporations are apparently to be selected as the first objects of attack, on the simple ground that they will be less powerful and less resolute than private proprietors in defending their rights. Hereditary owners care so much more for their children than for any possible theory about the tenure of land that they may be trusted to use their utmost efforts to resist any project of appropriation. Life annuitants, on the other hand, or tenants for a term of years, may always be fully compensated for their pecuniary interests, leaving the State, as in the case of the Irish Church, to enjoy in perpetuity the remainder which would have otherwise devolved, not on their heirs, but on their successors. Ministers who may be inclined to disestablish any wealthy corporation have every motive for offering liberal terms to the actual holders of the property; and an apparently equitable offer of compensation becomes more impressive when the legislator can threaten a harsher alternative in the contingency of refusal. It may be hoped that the present possessors of University endowments will be sufficiently loyal to the institutions which have provided them with a competence to regard with the utmost distaste any proposal to convert College estates into Government annuities; but their own incomes are held in the great majority of cases only for a short term of years, though a few incumbents retain their fellowships for life. Mr. GLADSTONE, Mr. GOSCHEN, and their colleagues will not hesitate to guarantee their dividends and their privileges at the expense of their corporate or academical prosperity; and for the present an ostensible equivalent will be offered for the whole College property. Hereafter it will be comparatively easy to persuade a democratic House of Commons that a charge on the national income presents the easiest and most obvious subject of retrenchment.

Mr. GOSCHEN hinted at a general disturbance of all the relations of the different classes which are connected with land; and he was perhaps only consistent in profiting by the popular objections to the tenure of land in mortmain. There can be no doubt that when, as in the fifteenth century, a large part of the entire surface of England was held by ecclesiastical corporations, an abuse existed which imperatively required correction. Abbots and bishops had less urgent motives than hereditary owners for making the most of their estates; while, on the other hand, it was a proverb in almost all parts of Europe that it was good to live under the crosier. That a half or a third of the land should be permanently withheld from circulation was a political and economical evil. When an estate belonging to a college, a hospital, or to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, lies here and there in the midst of ordinary properties, the objection disappears. Landowning corporations are without exception rich enough to provide the necessary improvements on their estates, and the agents who manage the property have probably less scruple in applying for the requisite funds to corporate bodies than to private employers, who must pay out of their own pockets. If Mr. GOSCHEN had inquired into the facts instead of relying on a general proposition or prejudice, he would probably have found that the tenants of Guy's Hospital or of Trinity College, Cambridge, are as liberally treated and as well satisfied as their neighbours who rent their farms from hereditary landlords. Even if it is the business of a Government to hunt about for instances in which production is for any reason artificially limited, the burden of showing that the possession of land by corporations interferes with profitable cultivation rests wholly on the restless official projectors. Some Colleges own considerable estates in towns which are administered, in precisely the same manner with adjacent house property and building land. If the owners are expropriated for a fair price, the State will gain nothing except the coveted facility of plundering at some future time hoards which have been converted into a more portable form. If it is asked why Colleges and similar bodies should object to sell their property at its market price, there is a twofold and conclusive answer. Real property is more secure than a Government annuity paid to a corporation; and the actual incumbents, as trustees for their successors, are bound to consider that its value is more elastic. If Mr. GOSCHEN had flourished in the days of Queen ELIZABETH, and had induced the QUEEN and Parliament to adopt his present scheme, the Universities and Colleges would have now had no property worth confiscating, if indeed they had not long since ceased to exist.



When the Ministerial plan is introduced into Parliament the representatives of the landed interest will have the opportunity of showing whether they possess rudimentary political instinct, or whether a deprivation of mental faculties has, according to the proverbial phrase, prepared them for ruin. Mr. GOSCHEN was perfectly justified in ridiculing poor Sir JOHN PAKINGTON for his feeble little bits of Socialism; but the stupidest squire who has not had his head turned by Cabinet office ought to be capable of understanding that it is his interest to resist the first attempt to tamper with property in land. It may well be that neighbouring proprietors hunger after the vineyards of corporate NABOTHS in the spirit in which the Irish landed gentry in the golden days of Home Rule abolished for their own benefit the tithe on agistment; but with Mr. GOSCHEN at the door, and Mr. MILL and Mr. OGER behind him, it is not a time for one class of landowners to facilitate the expropriation of another. Professor FAWCETT, in protesting against the predatory designs of the Government, made a pregnant suggestion which well deserves careful consideration. He said that he would advise the members for the Universities, if the Government projected a menacing inquiry into the tenure of College property, to move for a Commission to inquire into private property in land. The transmission of property by will or by descent is an institution on the whole advantageous; but hereditary succession is not a divine revelation nor a universal law. The endowments of Colleges and of other public bodies belong to the disinherited classes, who claim their contingent shares by laws as intelligible as the Statute of Distributions, and not on the whole more inequitable. It is not at first sight an immoral paradox that a small portion of the land in the country should belong to successful candidates in competitive examinations. Even where no duties are discharged by a temporary incumbent, his income is only a sinecure as the rental of a private landowner is a sinecure. The Communists have long since worked out the demonstration; and the confiscation of corporate estates will only whet their appetites for a more substantial meal. Well-meaning agitators in the Universities have done their utmost to invite the attack which will shortly be made on their endowments. Ingenious and accomplished young Fellows of Colleges have for several years amused themselves by devising all possible modifications in the existing system. But for their common and pardonable failing of inexperience, they would have known that, while it is often possible to maintain an existing institution, newfangled devices offer no resistance to popular excitement and cupidity. The outside reformers propose not to redistribute University endowments, but to seize the whole, or the greater part, for entirely alien purposes. It is highly conducive to their objects that before the attack is commenced all things should be unsettled from within. A dozen years ago, when Parliamentary Reform was impending, a similar set of theorists were incessantly employed on schemes for diluting the power of the democracy by some project of proportional or lateral reform. They were warned in vain that the only genuine or vigorous opponents of the system which then existed were resolved to tolerate no securities against their own predominance. Mr. GLADSTONE and Mr. GOSCHEN will probably, if they prosecute their attack on Universities and other corporate bodies of the same class, encounter a more formidable opposition than that of College pamphleteers. Mr. LOWE, who will probably be a leader of the new crusade, almost shipwrecked his political career at its commencement by broadly propounding, on the introduction of a Bill relating to Liverpool town dues, the doctrine that corporations were imaginary and fictitious entities, without any moral right to the property which they might possess. His thesis was sustained by many ingenious and plausible arguments, and it would perhaps have moved all but municipal bowels to hear the doubts he stated; but as soon as his speech appeared in the papers every corporation in the kingdom protested against his conclusions, and the Bill was summarily strangled. It is not impossible that a feeling of the same kind may be aroused by Mr. GOSCHEN's assault on property held in mortmain. The advocates of the Government measure will for the purposes of their argument be forced to dilate on the qualified character which they will attribute to corporate rights; and the landowners, although the comparative sanctity of their titles may be extolled, will scarcely be blind enough to accept the insidious compliment. If the county members vote for the confiscation of corporate estates, Mr. FAWCETT will do well, if the University members decline his advice, to propose an inquiry into the tenure of land by private owners.

## M. THIERS AND THE ASSEMBLY.

M. THIERS dearly loves to falsify expectations, and since the sitting of the Assembly on Monday he may be said to have given the rein to his passion. It must be admitted that the attitude of the Chamber was not one to gratify a President who wishes to be adored as well as obeyed. For the Government to declare that it could not accept a motion was enough to make the Assembly show it all the favour they could, short of actually adopting it. They twice refused priority to a motion which the Government had made its own; and though at last they would not face the consequences of rejecting it, nearly three hundred deputies altogether abstained from voting. To all appearance the acceptance of M. METTETAL's motion by M. THIERS was a piece of over-finesse. His two speeches had been entirely directed against the Right. There was no reference to M. GAMBETTA in any part of them, beyond a scornful denial that it was the speech at Grenoble that had really called up General CHANGARNIER. At every pause the Left had exhausted themselves in cheers; and if the Government could have supported a motion which the Left could have supported also, it seems certain that the majority in favour of it would have been considerably greater than that in favour of the motion actually carried. The Assembly had four resolutions to choose from. The Left began by demanding the order of the day pure and simple, but found only 133 deputies to support it. It distributed neither blame nor praise, it expressed neither confidence nor want of confidence, and consequently it pleased hardly anybody. Next came a resolution censuring the doctrines contained in M. GAMBETTA's speech, and accepting M. THIERS's condemnation of them—a condemnation which, in the Chamber at all events, had never been pronounced. The Government opposed this, and the 279 votes recorded in favour of it may be taken as representing the actual strength of the Right. Two resolutions remained—one originally proposed by Admiral JAUURÈS, and afterwards on his withdrawing it taken possession of by M. LEPÈRE, which expressed confidence in the Government, and made no mention of M. GAMBETTA; and one proposed by M. METTETAL, which combined with an expression of confidence in the Government a censure of the Grenoble speech. The Left supported M. LEPÈRE, and there was no reason why the Centres should not have supported him as well. M. THIERS had challenged a vote of confidence, and this resolution gave him precisely what he had asked for. He had said that M. GAMBETTA's speech was not the issue really raised, and M. LEPÈRE had taken him at his word and struck M. GAMBETTA out of his motion. There was nothing in the text of what remained which could have been unpalatable to any ordinary supporter of the Government. It embodied the confidence in M. THIERS, which the Left and the Centres alike feel, and omitted the censure on M. GAMBETTA in which the Left and the Centres could not unite. Instead however of accepting M. LEPÈRE's motion, M. DUFAURE announced that the Government elected to stand by M. METTETAL's motion. By this step the Left were thrown into opposition without the Right being conciliated. The number of abstentions was swelled by recruits from both extremes, so that out of an Assembly of 768 members, and on an occasion of extraordinary importance, only 263 deputies voted for the resolution which declared the final judgment of the Chamber. It is no wonder that the announcement of the numbers was received with uproarious laughter by the Right. M. THIERS's motive in refusing a simple vote of confidence, and in insisting upon having M. GAMBETTA censured at the same time, is probably to be found in his profound belief in his own skill as a Parliamentary tactician. He thought he could manage the Right and the Left at the same time. He reasoned that the Right would like forcing the Left to censure M. GAMBETTA, while the Left would like forcing the Right to declare their confidence in the Government, and that each would sink their own dislike to the motion in the delight of annoying their adversaries. This calculation proved to be altogether mistaken. The Right either voted against M. METTETAL, or did not vote at all; the Left either voted against M. METTETAL or did not vote at all. The result of M. THIERS's manoeuvring was that he obtained the votes of the Centres, which he would have had under any circumstances, and lost the votes of the Left, which he would have obtained if he had identified himself with M. LEPÈRE.

M. THIERS's action after the debate was of a piece with his action in the debate. Disgust at the failure of his over-ingenious scheme for securing a vote of confidence led him to make an immediate show of resignation. He announced this intention at a Cabinet Council on Monday evening; he repeated it at another Council on Tuesday morning; and for

some hours even those who knew the PRESIDENT best seem to have doubted whether this time he did not mean what he said. Looked at from M. THIERS's point of view, the check had been a severe one. If the coalition which kept three hundred deputies away from the division had gone a little further it would have given a decisive majority against the Government. M. THIERS has not been accustomed to see such determination on the part of his opponents, and his first idea seems to have been that it must be put down at any cost to himself and to France. In arriving at this conclusion he misconceived his own relation to the Assembly. There are occasions on which a vote such as that of Monday would rightly be accepted by a statesman as equivalent to a formal defeat. A Minister whose title to office is that he possesses the confidence of Parliament might properly hold that the confidence of Parliament cannot be adequately expressed by a vote in which not much more than half the House takes part. But M. THIERS's title to office is not that he possesses the confidence of Parliament. He stands in something the same position towards the Assembly as that in which an English Liberal Minister stands towards the House of Lords. The majority of the Assembly does not profess to be in sympathy with M. THIERS. It accepts him because it cannot help itself, and it is not at the trouble of concealing that this is the motive of its supporting him. On the other hand, M. THIERS does not hesitate to avow as often as occasion offers that he regards himself as the representative of the country as opposed to the Assembly, of the real majority as opposed to the technical majority. Under these circumstances abstention from effective opposition is the utmost that he can reasonably expect from the latter. In the House of Lords a political crisis is avoided by a large section of the Conservative peers walking out before the division. The Minister is satisfied because his Bill is carried; the House of Lords is satisfied because the consistency of individual peers has been maintained. It is hard to see why M. THIERS should be more exacting. There is an obvious necessity that the majority should allow themselves to be managed; but so long as there is no overt resistance to their master's will, it seems unreasonable that he should deny them the satisfaction of sulking while they obey. This, however, is what he has done in the present instance. Not to vote has been treated as an offence indistinguishable from voting wrong. M. THIERS is not content that his adversaries should practically acquiesce in his rule; he demands that they should proclaim their acquiescence by words as well as by deeds.

It is the more strange that M. THIERS should take this line because the whole tenor of his Message and even of his speeches on Monday pointed to a different course. He seemed at length to have satisfied himself that the Assembly and the country are not at one upon political matters, and that where they differ it is the country and not the Assembly that goes with the PRESIDENT. If he seriously contemplated resigning office, we do not see how he can be acquitted of having contemplated sacrificing the country to a mere technicality. Supposing that the Government were really to be handed over to Marshal MACMAHON or to a triumvirate in which Marshal MACMAHON would be associated with General CHANGARNIER and General LADMIRAULT, one of two consequences must inevitably follow. Either the country would be given over to a monarchical reaction which would undo all that M. THIERS and the course of events have built up between them, or the attempt to construct the proposed Government would be resisted by force of arms. Neither of these prospects can yield any pleasure to a patriotic statesman, and, with all his faults, M. THIERS has signally merited the title. It is only because he suffers himself to be led away by a too irritable self-esteem that he can have brought himself seriously to face such an alternative. So long as he can keep the Assembly under control, there is no reason why the present state of things should not continue, unsatisfactory as in many respects it is. But if ever the Assembly were to give effect to its latent dislike of the PRESIDENT by adopting measures which left him no option but to resign or to obtain a new Assembly, the latter would certainly be the right course for him to take. A representative Legislature which refuses to have its claim to the representative character analysed in the crucible of a general election may easily ride the technical argument too hard. A Parliamentary system which contains no provision for a dissolution is defective in one of its most essential attributes, and the Government that undertakes to supply it, even by irregular means, is not really false to Parliamentary tradition.

#### THE POLICE MUTINY.

THERE is no use in shutting our eyes to the fact that the mutiny of the Metropolitan Police is a very serious affair. For some time past the police have been threatening to strike, but a strike is very different from a mutiny. A strike does not take place without due warning. The men say what they want; their employers have time to consider whether or not they can afford to grant it; there is room for negotiation and compromise; and if, after all, the men go off, they only do what they have a perfect right to do if they choose. No man is bound to remain in a situation which does not suit him; but he is certainly bound to fulfil the terms of his engagement while it continues, and not to break it without fair notice. If this is true of any body of men, it is especially true of the police, upon whose loyal and uninterrupted service so much depends. It cannot be tolerated that a great city should be suddenly left unprotected just because the police happen to think that they have not been very well used. It is idle to talk about provocation as an excuse for such a mutiny as that which took place on Saturday night in three divisions of the Metropolitan Police. The men were mustered for night service. Just as they were starting they heard that GOODCHILD, the Secretary of the movement for obtaining an increase of pay, had been dismissed from the force, and they at once refused to go on duty. The result was that, though most of the men were afterwards persuaded to go upon their beats, a considerable part of the metropolis was for some hours most insecurely guarded. On Tuesday it was announced that a hundred and eighty constables had been suspended; and one was taken before a magistrate and sentenced to a month's imprisonment for inciting his comrades to withdraw from duty. After four days' deliberation one hundred and ten constables have been dismissed, and sixty-nine reduced to inferior grades, or, if already in the lowest class, fined. It can hardly be doubted that a grave error of judgment was committed in not at once dismissing every man who refused to obey orders, and taking the ringleaders into custody. Afterwards all the dismissed men who could be found should have been prosecuted, and either fined or imprisoned. In such a case the chief who hesitates is lost. Hesitation implies doubt, and nothing can be more fatal to the discipline of a large body of men than the notion that it is a matter of uncertainty whether a mutiny will be severely punished. It is impossible to imagine a more gross and unjustifiable act of insubordination than that of Saturday, and it should have been met by prompt, sharp, and decisive action. It would have been much better that London should have been left unguarded for a night, or even for a week, than that there should be any chance of a recurrence of such misconduct. It must be remembered that the constables did not know why GOODCHILD had been dismissed, that they allowed themselves no time for reflection or inquiry, and rebelled on the mere impulse of the moment. This is the sign of a very dangerous temper.

Whatever view may be taken of the dismissal of GOODCHILD cannot affect the gravity of the offence committed by the mutineers. They might have appealed to their superiors to reinstate their Secretary, and threatened to throw up their situations if this was refused; but they had no right to break their contract with the public, and to leave the town unprotected. It looks to us as if the police had a reasonable grievance, but no grievance will justify a mutiny. GOODCHILD had taken a prominent part in the agitation for an increase of pay. The agitation had been successful, and the men naturally resented the idea of their Secretary being made a scapegoat. The way in which GOODCHILD was treated is apparently an example of the sort of small revenge which weak men are apt to take on people who offend them. The Commissioners seem to have been afraid, in the first instance, to dismiss him; so they exiled him to Bromley. GOODCHILD resisted, and was then dismissed. Accordingly, it is said that he was discharged, not for being Secretary to the policemen, but for refusing to go to Bromley. It is clear that, if GOODCHILD was guilty of a breach of discipline in heading the agitation, he should have been dismissed at once, and the reason of his dismissal should have been courageously avowed. GOODCHILD's subsequent conduct has shown that he is not a desirable person to have in the force, but if he was to be punished or got rid of, it should have been done openly and boldly. His banishment to Bromley was the characteristic blunder of an imbecile administration. It is one of those feeble, faltering half-measures that make one think of Mr. BRUCE directly. If, when the movement for an advance of pay began to take the form of public meetings at which insolent speeches were delivered, the Chief Commis-



minor had summarily dismissed the ringleaders, and intimated that no application with regard to pay would be considered until the meetings had ceased, he would have done well. If he had refused altogether to give any answer on the subject, he would have done better still. The police is not a military force, and cannot be subjected to absolute military discipline. It bears, however, so close a resemblance to an army that some approach to military discipline is indispensable. The men may be free to join or quit the force at short notice, but while they remain in it the forms of obedience, subordination, and respect for superiors should be strictly maintained. It is evident that the police require to be much more firmly handled than they have been for some time past. Firmness need not of course mean harshness or severity. Its essential meaning is that the chiefs should make up their minds very decidedly how the force is to be managed, and should then resolutely carry out their conclusions, without listening to, or permitting, any arguments or remonstrances from the men. No good can come of trying to coax, humour, or higgie with such a body. It should be determined what is a liberal market price for this kind of labour, and what advantages can be offered besides those of good wages; and when these terms have been fixed, the men should be at liberty to take them or leave them. If the wages are not high enough to attract qualified recruits, they should be raised; and it is clearly the business of the Commissioners to see to this, and to take care to be beforehand in doing what is right, instead of having to surrender under the pressure of a strike, or of a threat of one. There is no reason why there should not be the freest and most confidential communication between all ranks within the force; indeed it is highly desirable that there should be. The constables should communicate with the sergeants, the sergeants with the inspectors and superintendents, and these again with the higher officers. But anything like a public organization on the part of the men to coerce their chiefs should be resolutely prohibited.

It will be a great mistake if it is supposed that this mutiny is only an accident of the hour, and that when the worst of the rebels have been got rid of, and new men have been put in their places, everything will go on smoothly and comfortably. The mutiny is a symptom of a grave, deep-seated, constitutional disorder. It is a malady of the blood, and rubbing off the pimples will not cure the patient. There is no reason to believe that the men who refused to go on duty on Saturday are not a fair sample of the whole force, or that the day reliefs, if they had been present, would not have acted precisely as the night reliefs did. It is impossible to suppose that, if the Metropolitan Police had been in a sound, healthy condition, if the relations between the men and their officers had been what they ought to be, such an outbreak would ever have occurred. It is right that the mutineers should be discharged, although, as we have said, they should have been discharged without a moment's hesitation, and prosecuted into the bargain; but it is still more important that the state of the rest of the force, and not only the lower, but the higher ranks, should be keenly scrutinized. It certainly seems to us as if the authorities—we say authorities because we must include the HOME SECRETARY along with the Commissioners, who are under his orders—have for some time been labouring diligently to produce among the police just that state of mind which is likely to generate a mutiny. They are asked for an increase of pay, and for some time they do not know whether to say Yes or No; then a strike is threatened, and they say Yes in a funk, and relieve their ill-temper by doing what looks very like kicking one of the delegates in a cowardly way behind the backs of his companions. They are at great pains to teach the men that they are afraid of them, and then they suddenly exasperate the men on a very sensitive point, as if to see how far the lesson has taken effect. Every delegate at once imagined that GOODCHILD'S fate would be his own. The little mutiny among the postmen, who, begging for more pay, were offered instead little bits of cloth to sew on their sleeves, brings to light another example of the same ignorance of human nature which produced the more serious mutiny of the police, and which has got the Government into fresh trouble with the sedition-mongers in the Parks. The radical mistake which has been made in regard to the police has been in forgetting the highly artificial nature of the authority which is exercised by such a body. It is not an authority derived exclusively from sheer physical force. If the police had, as a rule, to engage in pitched battles with the disorderly and criminal classes, it is doubtful whether they might not have the worst of it. Their numbers would have to be greatly increased, and all good citizens would have to

be in constant readiness to reinforce them. It is not desirable that the actual amount of physical force which the police can bring to bear on the preservation of order should be put to the test if it can possibly be avoided. It is much better that they should be enabled to rely on moral force in the discharge of their ordinary duties, and that their physical strength should be kept in the background. Unfortunately ever since the present Ministry came into office they appear to have been doing all they can to degrade, humiliate, and distress the police; making all sorts of difficulties for them, and then, as it were, tying their hands and exposing them to the jeers and curses of the scum of London. Three Sundays ago the police were paraded in Hyde Park for no other object than that they might be hustled and hooted, while every kind of disorder was going on around them. The self-respect of the police, as well as popular respect for them and awe of them, have equally been destroyed. The police have learned, it seems, to show great "forbearance" to the mob; but they have also learned something more, and that is to copy the mob's tactics and bearing for their own use in their dealings with their superiors.

#### RUSSIAN POLICY IN CENTRAL ASIA.

THE Russian Government has thought it worth while to publish a semi-official explanation of the recent and impending extensions of the Empire in Central Asia. It is proverbially useless to argue against the master of irresistible legions; and, when he himself commences the controversy, there would be little object in exposing fallacies when deficient logic has a supplement of force behind it. The historical narrative which contains the authorised apology for Russian aggression is both plausible and for the most part probable. Civilized Governments invariably come into collision with any barbarous tribes which may approach their remote borders; and, whether or not they are fully justified in conquering disorderly territories, the process is nearly certain to proceed, and the transaction is ultimately delineated not by the lion but by the man. Russian traders naturally seek their fortunes in the neighbouring countries; and not less naturally they are liable to capricious ill-treatment and occasional spoliation. When several cases of the kind have occurred, the Governor of the frontier provinces sends a detachment of troops to the delinquent district, and probably he takes the opportunity of erecting two or three forts in which his countrymen may for the future take refuge. The neighbouring tribes perhaps attack the fort, or intercept a convoy, and ultimately the Khan or Ameer who exercises nominal sovereignty in the country is required, on pain of invasion and expropriation, to make a treaty for the prevention of further outrages. The inevitable breach of the treaty is punished by a complete conquest; and it is a question of circumstances and of expediency whether the new acquisition is governed by a Russian general, or by the native ruler in the capacity of a tributary and dependent. The Roman Empire and the Anglo-Indian Empire grew up in much the same way; and neither patriotic Russians nor candid foreign critics are likely to inquire too curiously into the strict propriety of every diplomatic and military proceeding during the steady advance of Russia in the East.

The late treaty between the Russian Government and the ATALEGH GHAAZEE, or ruler of Eastern Turkestan, is vindicated on special grounds; and it may be inferred that a negotiation which is thought to require a defence was not unaccompanied by difficulties. There is no reason why Russia or any other State should not make a commercial treaty with any potentate who may be willing to enter into relations of trade and friendly intercourse; but if the European law of nations prevailed in the remote regions of Asia, such a contract would be on both sides equally voluntary. It may be inferred, from the statement of the official organ, that the ATALEGH GHAAZEE was not in the first instance anxious to conclude another treaty of the same kind with those which have reduced the chiefs of Central Asia to a dependent condition. It was perhaps not without surprise that he found himself from the beginning hampered by previous engagements of which he is not likely to have had a familiar knowledge. His dominions were, before the modern Mahometan revival, included in the Chinese Empire. The Treaty of Tientsin secures to Russian traders and travellers protection in China, and the covenant, according to the Russian interpretation, is held to run with the land. The Turcoman purchaser or conqueror accordingly finds himself standing in the shoes of his predecessor, whose servitudes he inherits or acquires with his territories and revenues. The

historical chronology of Central Asia is not popularly understood, and it might perhaps be hypercritical to express a doubt whether the independence of Eastern Turkestan was anterior or subsequent to the Treaty of Tientsin. Lord ELGIN and the commanders of the English fleet and army little thought that they were creating rights which could be enforced by Russia against a Mahometan chief on the North-Western border of the Chinese Empire; but probably the ATALEGH GHAZEE thought more of might than of right, and he may have reflected that if, according to the Russian theory, he was already bound to allow commercial intercourse, his position could scarcely be made worse by a new and formal Treaty. It is thought that the same potentate was at one time inclined to facilitate trade with India; but the envoy who was sent to his Court was obliged to return without obtaining an audience; and it must be obvious that political support from a country separated by almost impassable mountains from Eastern Turkestan could be neither steady nor effective. There is much reason to fear that the Russians will profit by their conquests and treaties, not only for the legitimate extension of their own trade, but for the discouragement of foreign rivalry. Russia is in the same stage of economical progress which had been reached in England a century ago, and the Imperial Government deliberately conquers markets instead of simply encouraging its merchants to frequent them. The districts which have been avowedly annexed to the Empire will of course be inclosed within the restrictions of the Russian tariff; and the dependent chiefs will be induced or compelled to accept a Russian Customs-Union.

The motives which have induced the Russian Government to publish an apology for its proceedings in Central Asia are not at first sight obvious. The philanthropists in England and elsewhere who are in the habit of congratulating themselves on the diffusion of civilization by the armies of Russia require no explanation of a consistently beneficent policy; and more morose politicians who regard Russian ambition with jealousy will scarcely be convinced or conciliated by a demonstration of the pacific objects of successive conquests. The point of the communication is perhaps to be found in a postscript or concluding passage which is specially addressed to England. The writer repeatedly praises English statesmen and the English press for the candid tone in which they have dealt with the politics of Central Asia. It might have been added that some journalists have, by the excessive liberality of their comments, justified a suspicion that their acquiescence was founded on conscious inability to resist. It is certain that the Russians have nothing to complain of; and the answer of the Viceroy of INDIA to the Envoy of the Khan of KHIVA involved a formal repudiation of any purpose of attempting to check Russian aggrandizement. The Russian apologist, or the Government which he defends, is apparently not yet fully satisfied. After an elaborate exposition of the peaceable and unaggressive character of the Russian policy in Asia, the writer proceeds, not without a certain inconsistency, to admit the charge which he had apparently undertaken to refute. It seems that the extension of Russian dominion in Asia implies no purpose of interfering with India, with one significant exception. It is suggested that if England should unhappily abandon its patient and confiding attitude, and especially if there should be any collision of interests in Europe, it might become expedient, as it would be practicable, to create a diversion by promoting a native rebellion in India. Turkestan is therefore to furnish additional facilities for the conquest of Turkey, and in any quarrel with Russia India is to profit by the boasted advance of civilization in the form of domestic and foreign war. It might have been thought that the deferential readiness with which the Treaty of Paris was cancelled on the demand of Prince GORTCHAKOFF might have been rewarded by a somewhat longer interval of immunity from hostile threats; but it is unfortunately true that a reputation for weakness is not the best security against affronts. It is of course evident to all Russians, and to all Englishmen who are not determined in their optimism, that the advance of the Russian arms in Central Asia exposes the Indian Empire to new, though not necessarily to overwhelming, dangers. If no resistance is offered to the approach of a formidable neighbour, a passive policy is explained and justified both by the absence of any legitimate ground of interference and by the material difficulties of operations which must be carried on, if at all, at a distance. There seems to be no sufficient reason for gratuitously reminding the English Government that Russian progress in the East may react on the international relations of Europe. It is, indeed, not likely that the present Ministers will either

feel or confess a suspicion that any Power can at any time be unjust or aggressive; but foreign statesmen will do well to remember that public opinion is subject to oscillations, and that successive discomfitures may perhaps sooner or later produce a reaction. It is a more practical consideration that in Asiatic affairs Russia would have to deal, not with a party in the House of Commons, but with a strongly organized Government, disposing of a large and powerful army. The soldiers and civilians who direct the military and political transactions of India are not characterized for the most part either by extreme timidity or by amiable credulity. At any point of contact which may be selected, the Indian Government will be stronger and far nearer its resources than any foreign invader; nor is it probable that Russia could afford effective assistance to internal rebels. In the meantime it would perhaps be desirable that both parties should affect a conventional belief in the impossibility of collision; and it was certainly not the business of the probable aggressor to begin the interchange of defiance.

#### LEGAL EDUCATION.

WHEN, early last Session, the present Lord CHANCELLOR submitted to the House of Commons his scheme for establishing a new School of Law, he was met by the reply that the Inns of Court were quite capable of furnishing all the legal education wanted for members of the Bar, and were prepared to do at once all that was required. The Inns of Court without delay set themselves to redeem the pledge thus given. A Committee was appointed to suggest a comprehensive scheme of education, and during the summer bestowed much labour and thought on its task. By the end of the Long Vacation it had its scheme matured, and this scheme is now in course of being submitted to the four Inns for their confirmation. It is, on the whole, a most satisfactory measure, although there are some imperfections in it for which experience will no doubt suggest a remedy. Its merits are so great that it would be a serious misfortune if the opportunity were lost of putting it in practical operation, as is proposed, from the beginning of next year, and the few changes desirable in it could be easily made as time went on. Its main excellences are these. It provides for an examination before call to the Bar, conducted by a Board independent of the Professorial staff, and forcing every future barrister to have gone through a very wide course of instruction. It proposes to spend money freely for the purpose of getting efficient tutors and examiners, and rewarding merit in students; and it removes much of the jealousy between the Inns which has hitherto stood in the way of improvement by providing that, while all the Inns shall make, as at present, a small equal payment, what is wanted beyond shall be furnished proportionately by each Inn according as its members succeed in passing the examination or gaining studentships; so that the Inn will pay most which does its work best, and thus gains most wealth by attracting new members to its society. The race of barristers qualified by dinners, or by mere attendance at lectures or in chambers, or by a slight and fragmentary examination, will disappear, and every one henceforward called to the Bar will be required to show a satisfactory knowledge of Roman Civil Law, of the Law of Real and Personal Property, and of both Common Law and Equity. The ground will thus be laid for two great changes; for the English Bar becoming acquainted with the rudiments of a great legal system outside that of England, and for its also knowing the outlines both of Equity and Common Law, so that the way may be prepared for the importation into English Law of such of the principles of Roman and Continental Law as it may be desirable to import, and for the fusion of Law and Equity. The range of the examination is also so great that, unless the standard of necessary attainment is practically kept very low, an English barrister will henceforward be a person who must at some time have worked tolerably hard at learning law. This elevation of the pitch of legal knowledge of the whole body of the Bar is the basis of the whole scheme; and as it will undoubtedly deter many men from trying to be called who have hitherto looked on the simple name of a barrister as worth having, and will thus diminish the revenues of the Inns of Court, the governing bodies of those societies will, in adopting the scheme, deserve the credit of having postponed considerations of self-interest to the thought of the public good.

It is only to minor and subsidiary parts of the scheme that exception can be taken. The provision most open to objection is that which regards the studentships to be given as prizes for merit. There is no want of liberality in the pro-



posul. Eight studentships of one hundred guineas each are to be given away every year. But then all these prizes are to be awarded for proficiency in one single branch of study, that of Roman Law and Jurisprudence. The framers of the scheme seem to have considered that it is precisely in the knowledge of this branch that English barristers are most deficient; and therefore they determined to stimulate by all the artificial means in their power the knowledge of that which is least known. But in a great scheme of education which affects men of various classes and acquirements and habits there are other things to be thought of than the mere fostering of high knowledge in one department of learning. Prizes ought to be open to all students of ability and industry; but under the scheme there will be no rewards whatever accessible to the generality of clever and hardworking students. It seems on the face of it absurd that English lawyers should not be in any way rewarded for the knowledge of English law. In point of fact these studentships will not, it is to be feared, stimulate legal learning among any but a very few students. Roman Civil Law requires, when an acquaintance with it is pushed beyond the rudiments, such a knowledge of difficult Latin as none have except good classical scholars. The best University men will come up and carry off these studentships as a matter of course, and the general body of students will have no more concern with them than if they were awarded for proficiency in astronomy or chemistry; while again these fortunate prizemen may after all never attain a real knowledge of English Law, without which their special knowledge is not of much use either to the profession or the public. It also seems hard that students who have already been some time entered, and have been working for prizes held out to them in English as well as Roman Law, should suddenly find their hopes frustrated, and should see nothing open to them except a competition in a very limited field to which their attention has not been directed. It is true that the scheme proposes that there shall be an Honour list, with the classes arranged alphabetically, and that two terms may be dispensed with in favour of those placed in the first class; and success in this Honour list will be determined by examination in all the branches of English Law as well as in Roman Law. Those who attain a high knowledge of English Law have therefore the hope of some slight reward. But it is not nearly a reward sufficient to compensate them for having all pecuniary prizes taken from them. A stroke of the pen would remedy the whole mischief, and if, after the scheme has been confirmed, the Executive Council of Education were authorised to announce that half of the yearly studentships would be awarded for proficiency exclusively in Roman Law and Jurisprudence, and half for proficiency in all the branches of law recognized in the scheme of education, much disappointment and disapproval would be averted.

One of the greatest changes in the new as compared with the present system affects the teachers of law. In the first place, the chair of Constitutional Law and Legal History is to be wholly abolished. The subject is to be nominally tacked on to the sphere of the Professor of Jurisprudence and Roman Law; but it is obvious that neither will he have the opportunity of lecturing seriously in this new department, as he must give his first thoughts to his own comprehensive subjects for proficiency in which all the prizes attainable are to be awarded, nor will he be able to bestow the study requisite to master so laborious and complicated a subject as the Legal History of England. It is not difficult to see how the conclusion at which the framers of the scheme arrived came to be adopted. They had already weighted the ordinary barrister to the utmost that he could be expected to bear. Having to learn something of every branch of English Law, and also something of Roman Law, he would break down if he were also made to know something of Constitutional Law and Legal History. Then, if the prizes are regarded, Roman Law and Jurisprudence are to sweep all away. Constitutional Law and Legal History is therefore only to be one of the subjects in which candidates for honours are to be examined, and a special Professor seems hardly necessary for a branch to which such slight practical importance was assigned. In order to start the scheme it may therefore be advisable that this chair should be abolished. But in course of time it will be necessary that the sphere of the Professor of Jurisprudence should be subdivided, for no scheme of legal education can be complete which does not recognize that law may be taught in two ways of equal importance—philosophically and historically; and that a knowledge of English Law will always be imperfect, unless the history of its growth has been connected with the history of the growth of

the English nation. In the next place, it appears to be intended that the Professors should only hold their appointments for a short period, as at the end of every three years the office is to be thrown open to competition by public advertisements, and it would make the proceeding a farce if the last tenants of the chair were always, or even ordinarily, re-elected. This plan of constantly recruiting the tutorial staff secures the advantage of having a succession of fresh minds, but it is open to the strong objection that it prevents a teacher from devoting his life to a special sphere of study, and thus attaining an eminence which would place him on a par with the best Legal Professors of Foreign Universities.

There remains only one more point to be noticed, which was not without difficulty, but as to which the framers of the scheme have arrived, we think, at the right conclusion. At present Indian students are allowed to be called at the end of two years instead of three, if they pass not only in certain prescribed branches of English Law, but also in special portions of Indian Law. The origin of this concession was, we believe, that some Indian civilians thought that they would get more rapid promotion in their own service if they had been called to the Bar, while the duration of their furlough prevented them from studying in England for more than two years. It is no part of the duty of an English School of Law to help men to rise in the Indian Civil Service; but the concession thus accorded has been taken advantage of by several natives, who come over here in order to be qualified to practise at the Indian Bar. Injustice to individuals is prevented by its being provided that the existing privilege shall be continued in favour of all natives who may have entered before the end of the present year; but for the future the new scheme provides that natives of India shall be placed on exactly the same footing as other students, must pass the same examinations, and spend the same time in training, unless they can get off two terms by securing a place in the first class of honours. This is no hardship on the Indians. They come here in order that they may be put in India on an equality with English barristers, and the conditions ought to be the same for all. The period of training for all is henceforward to be reduced to nine terms, so that at the end of two years and a quarter, instead of two years as at present, the Indians may be called just as their English fellow-students may be; and during this period it is the business of the Inns of Court to give them as well as Englishmen intended to practise at the Indian Bar a general education of the highest practical kind, and not to direct their attention to special portions of local law, which natives will learn with the greatest ease in India, and in learning which they start, so far as Hindu and Mahomedan law go, with great advantage over their English rivals at the Indian Bar. In describing this scheme of education, it should be added, however, that its authors take occasion to record publicly what all students should bear in mind, that all this legal instruction can never make a competent practising barrister, and that subsequent reading in chambers is absolutely necessary before the most successful student can be worth a guinea to any English attorney. In short, the scheme bears throughout traces of care and thought, as well as of boldness; and when its details have been modified so far as to give due encouragement to the study of English Law, and especially of English Law in its more general and historical aspects, it will be found, we may trust, as satisfactory in practice as in its conception it is creditable to its authors.

#### THE COLONIES.

LORD KIMBERLEY probably finds few of his official duties more irksome than the obligation of periodically taking the chair at Colonial dinners; but a judicious Minister may console himself with the reflection that place and power are not to be had for nothing. The last occasion of the kind was in celebration of the completion of telegraphic communication with Australia; and an experienced Chairman may have anticipated with a sort of horror the two strings of commonplaces which must inevitably form the subject of his speeches. It was indispensable to express admiration for the electric telegraph, and to praise colonies in general, and the Australian settlements in particular; and the orator may reasonably have regretted, with the eulogist of HERCULES, that no one had been considerate enough to provide him with materials for a speech by abusing either telegraphic inventors or colonists. In default of an antagonist to confute, Lord KIMBERLEY naturally wished for a substitute with an inexhaustible supply of rhetoric. As he

justly observed, Mr. GLADSTONE would, if he had occupied the post of Chairman, have found no difficulty in speaking at any length which might have been thought desirable on telegraphs or any other subject. In the absence of the PRIME MINISTER, the COLONIAL SECRETARY accomplished the prescribed task with creditable success, though it must be almost as difficult to discourse on telegraphy as on the earlier and much less ingenious invention of printing. The utility of both contrivances depends in each separate case on the value of the communications which they convey; and it might be contended by the admirers of the electric telegraph that, in consequence of the cost of messages, the wires are seldom used, like types in the majority of books, for the transmission of rubbish. It is only when harmless compliments are on special occasions exchanged between distant countries that sentimental phrases are telegraphed to the Antipodes, or even from one station in England to another. The price of gold and the price of wool will be the principal subjects of telegraphic correspondence with Australia until the charges are so far reduced that persons of moderate means may be enabled to send domestic and private messages to their distant friends. How the electric telegraph saves labour, and how it tends to unite remote regions in the bonds of affection, may be learnt from Lord KIMBERLEY's conscientious essay on the subject; and it would be useless to inquire whether the invention may sometimes cause trouble and facilitate quarrels. In some rare instances the local Governors will have the opportunity of receiving instructions from the Colonial Office on embarrassing points of official duty. On the whole, the establishment of an Australian telegraph will be an advantage; and the energy with which the internal communication between the Australian capitals has been prosecuted is highly creditable to the colonists.

Although it must be almost as laborious to expatiate on the uses of the electric telegraph as to extol the utility of the alphabet, the speaker has at least the satisfaction of knowing that he is exempt from criticism or contradiction. Mere civilities to colonial communities are included in the same class of respectable commonplace; but unluckily it has become incumbent on Ministers, and especially on Colonial Secretaries, to assert on all suitable occasions their determination to maintain the integrity of the Empire; and their assurances are not always implicitly believed. As Lord KIMBERLEY said, no body of politicians, numerous or powerful enough to be called a party, desires to promote the separation of the colonies from the mother-country; but the indiscreet expressions of statesmen and the capricious declarations of journalists have created a mischievous feeling of irritation and suspicion. For their own part colonists are seldom scrupulous to avoid offending the feelings of those who are devoted to the maintenance of Imperial unity. When a constitutional deadlock occurs, when emigration is too abundant or too slack, or when a Government grants or refuses a dissolution of Parliament, colonial indignation almost invariably expresses itself in menaces of an immediate or future declaration of independence. A few years since Australian patriots proposed to imitate the example of the North American colonies in the last century because a few convicts were annually sent from England to a remote corner of their own continent. The Imperial Government judiciously conceded the point in dispute, but on more than one subsequent occasion the same threat has been used. The connexion would probably before this time have been severed but for the extreme laxity and elasticity of the bond which in modern times unites the outlying portions of the Empire to the central seat of Government. The concession of the qualified independence which is called responsible government was rather a negative proof of practical good sense than a masterpiece of political wisdom; but it has down to the present time served its chief purpose by preventing or rendering innocuous the collisions which would have occurred under the old system. It is perfectly natural that colonists, though they hold themselves at liberty to threaten secession, should angrily resent any display of Imperial indifference to the continuance of an almost nominal union. England probably occupies a larger place in the colonial imagination than any colony occupies in the thoughts of ordinary English politicians. The limited or disputable character of the advantages which accrue to the mother-country from a sovereignty which includes no power of control, and the risks and responsibilities which attach to the nominal tenure of distant possessions, are less keenly appreciated by colonists than by English administrators. The alleged negligence of a subordinate officer at the other side of the world was lately held by the Arbitrators at Geneva to render the Imperial Government liable for all the supposed conse-

quences of the miscarriage. It must be admitted that if Melbourne had been the capital of an independent State, although there would have been no *Shenandoah* damages, there might have been a civil war, an *Alabama* case, and an Arbitration arising in the Southern hemisphere. The dealings of the United States with England from the date of their independence are not encouraging to optimists who hold that ties of blood and language would be more effectual than relations of political unity.

A sect of economists and utilitarian politicians has for many years denied the expediency of retaining any dependency, and their doctrines unfortunately found favour at one time in official quarters. In his administration of the Colonial Office Lord GRANVILLE was less judicious and less successful than in any other part of his long career. Departing from his habitual manner and character, he displayed a harsh tenacity in his dealings with New Zealand, at a time when policy would have required the combination of the utmost courtesy and gentleness with firmness of purpose. It is now universally agreed that it was right to withdraw the English garrison from New Zealand; but Lord GRANVILLE, instead of relying on considerations of Imperial policy, took the opportunity of entering into a hostile controversy with the colonists. From expressions used about the same time by the Colonial Minister and by some of his colleagues, it was not unreasonably inferred that they inclined to the doctrine of secession. Lord KIMBERLEY, who has profited by experience of the unfavourable impression which was then produced, may in some degree attribute to his predecessor the troublesome necessity which has devolved upon himself of repudiating on all possible occasions any desire to promote disruption. Mr. GOSCHEN in his late speech at Bristol expressed with vigour and with evident sincerity his own adhesion to a larger and more ambitious conception of political duty. The arguments of the secessionists are not without force in showing that the colonies make no direct contribution to the material wealth or power of England. If the doctrines of Free-trade had prevailed a century earlier, the fabric of colonial dominion would perhaps never have been erected; but it is a shallow and hasty conclusion that all the advantages of an Imperial position disappear with the power and the wish of imposing differential duties. To a great naval Power it is of the utmost importance to possess harbours in all parts of the world where its cruisers will be at home. It is found that a nominal political unity is accompanied by a similarity of tastes and of customs and fashions which largely increases the demand for English goods in colonial markets. The paramount reason for maintaining the connexion as long as it is agreeable to the colonists is that the possibilities of a colonial Empire have not yet been ascertained or exhausted. A policy of disruption could never be retraced, and the result, in whatever manner it might be effected, would almost certainly leave some feeling of bitterness behind. If the Canadians listened to the appeal which was lately addressed to them in a spirit of reckless levity, they would after their separation be as unfriendly as their Southern neighbours to the Power which had contumeliously cast them off. The opinion of the English nation has within the last few years been so plainly expressed that it may perhaps soon cease to be necessary to disclaim intentions which no statesman or party professes. Lord KIMBERLEY's becoming and patriotic declarations are by this time known in Australia, and the electric telegraph is well employed in the encouragement of colonial loyalty.

#### MR. AYRTON'S RULES.

THERE are two questions involved in the prosecution of the persons who got up the recent Fenian meeting in Hyde Park—a question of law, and a question of Ministerial good faith. It would seem to be absurdly supposed that the latter can be submitted for a judicial decision. Mr. NEWTON, the police magistrate before whom the case was taken, held that he was precluded from going beyond the four corners of the Act, and could have nothing to do with speeches in Parliament. He also declined the invitation of the counsel for the defence to say whether he thought the Act a reasonable one. Most people will be of opinion that Mr. NEWTON showed a wise discretion in reducing the inquiry, as far as he was concerned, to its simplest form. A police magistrate has plenty to do already without attempting to decide whether Acts of Parliament are reasonable and in accordance with Ministerial professions. It may be assumed that the superior Court to which an appeal is to be carried will also decline to commit itself to the principle that Acts are henceforth to be construed along with all the debates which may have taken



place upon them as they were passing through Parliament. The interpretation of the law is sometimes found to be difficult enough already; but it would become still more trying if the Judges had to discover not only the meaning of the words of a statute, but the meaning of speeches made by members of Parliament. In order to do this effectually, it might be necessary to examine the speakers, and Mr. GLADSTONE and Mr. DISRAELI would have to spend a good deal of time in the witness-box. The inquiry could hardly be confined to speeches delivered within the walls of Parliament, which are of no more legal authority or significance than speeches delivered anywhere else, but would have to be extended to what are sometimes called extra-Parliamentary utterances. The meaning of a clause of the Irish Land Act might have to be elucidated by reference to a famous lecture upon upas-trees, while the Compound Householder could not be disposed of without a judicial definition of "flesh and blood." In the present instance it would not be enough to turn to *Hansard* and to see what Mr. GLADSTONE and Mr. AYRTON had to say about the Parks Bill. It would have to be ascertained whether the reports were accurate, and whether the language of the speakers exactly expressed the meaning they intended to convey. It might also be thought necessary to go further back, and to inquire whether any light was thrown on the intentions of the Government by the previous relations of members of that body with the rioters against whom the Act professed to be directed. A course of investigation which would afford Mr. GLADSTONE an opportunity of explaining to Mr. Serjeant BALLANTINE his "fatherly" reception of FINLEN at Carlton Gardens would not be without an attractiveness of a certain kind. It can hardly be doubted, however, that the Judges, with a TICHBORNE trial already on their hands, will prefer to follow Mr. NEWTON in interpreting the Act by itself without reference to speeches either in or out of Parliament.

Taking the Act as it stands there is no difficulty in reading it as Mr. NEWTON read it. The Act authorises the Board of Works to make regulations as to the use of the Parks by the public. It also provides that those rules shall be laid before Parliament, and that, if any part of them shall within a month be disapproved by either House, such rule or part of a rule shall not be enforced. The Act does not say that the rules shall not come into operation until they have been ratified by Parliament. It only gives power to either House to cancel a rule or part of a rule by a simple resolution, without going through the tedious process of passing an amending or repealing law. It has been pointed out that there is nothing whatever in the Act to prevent the FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS from making any rules he pleases during the recess, and changing them every month, or every week, or as often as he likes. If Parliament is sitting the rules must "forthwith" be laid before it, but if it is not sitting, then the FIRST COMMISSIONER can issue his edicts at his own discretion until the next Session comes round. It appears that the rules now in question were not made until after Parliament was prorogued. Certain rules were indeed printed last Session among the Parliamentary papers, but these were different rules from those now placarded at the gates of the Parks. So far as the law is to be gathered from an Act of Parliament, it would seem in this instance to be sufficiently clear and precise. Mr. AYRTON has exercised the authority conferred on him by the Royal Parks and Gardens Act, and there is apparently no check on the exercise of this authority until Parliament is again in Session. Whether such a law is reasonable, or whether it is in accordance with the pledges of the Government and the general understanding arrived at in the House of Commons, are questions of another kind. Mr. V. HARCOURT and Mr. RYLANDS assert that they distinctly understood the Government to promise that the new rules should not be enforced until Parliament had had an opportunity of considering them, and Mr. AYRTON's assurance that the public should be allowed in the meantime to enjoy the Parks as they had hitherto enjoyed them seems to bear out this impression. Whatever may be the judicial decision on the subject, the simple fact that there should be a possibility of doubt as to the state of the law is in itself a sufficient condemnation of the conduct of the FIRST COMMISSIONER. The question was one as to which it was of the utmost importance that there should be no opening for cavil or dispute. The management of the Parks had been gradually drifting into absolute and insufferable anarchy. The old common law rights of the Crown had unfortunately been discredited by factious doubts and weak official surrenders. It was necessary to make a fresh start, and it was thought that this could best be done by means of new rules, fresh from the mint of Parliament, which everybody would understand and respect, and which the Government

would have no hesitation in enforcing. The only object of legislation was to bring in Parliament at the back of the Government, and to invest the law with an authority which nobody could question. It is obvious that in order to produce this result the assent of Parliament should have been loyally and frankly obtained. As it is, the law has the appearance, not of a resolute Parliamentary decree, but of a Ministerial manoeuvre. It is not desirable that malicious demagogues should be enabled to suggest that the Government passes laws, as the juggler does the card in his sleeve, by sleight-of-hand.

With the persons who have been prosecuted for holding an illegal meeting in Hyde Park we of course have not the slightest sympathy. They deliberately went out of their way to break what they were told was the law and to defy the Government. They were quite aware of the nature of the rules posted at the gates of the Park, but they wished, as they said, to test their validity. Because the law on a certain point may be doubtful, it does not follow that any one can violate it with impunity. Anybody can "test" the question if he likes, but he must be prepared to take the consequences; and if the consequences are disagreeable, he should remember that he brought them on himself. This is the only consolation we have to offer to Mr. ODGER and his companions. The only reason for holding the Fenian meeting in Hyde Park instead of at Clerkenwell Green was that meetings in Hyde Park were forbidden, except under certain conditions which it was resolved to ignore. The proper course would have been not to brave the law, even if it was doubtful, but to appeal to Parliament to punish a Ministerial breach of faith. It is true the demonstrationists may have imagined that they were only engaging in what is called a friendly suit, and the previous conduct of members of the Government may have seemed to justify their expectation of sympathy in that quarter. Mr. BEALES's elevation to the Bench has not been forgotten, and although Mr. ODGER does not at present possess the necessary qualifications for judicial office, he might, according to the *Éwelle* precedent, obtain them after he had been appointed. It was impossible that the persistent encouragement which has been given to brawling and sedition should not bear fruit in fresh aggressions and more wanton insolence; and the manner in which a tardy vindication of the law has now been attempted can hardly fail to produce deplorable results. The demagogues may have the worst of it in the law courts, but their martyrdom will be a great advantage to their oratory. A disastrous ingenuity has been exercised in bringing the law into suspicion, and supplying a pretext for breaking it.

How far the Government as a body is responsible for what has occurred is not yet known. If Mr. AYRTON remains at the Board of Works, it will be understood that the Government is satisfied with the course he has taken, and is ready to justify it. After what has already happened, we are prepared for almost anything—almost even for this. That Mr. AYRTON should ever have been chosen for such an office was in itself astonishing enough; that he should have been allowed to stay there after the line of conduct he had laid down for himself was known, and its effects had begun to be apparent, must have pretty well used up any ordinary capacity for amazement. There is perhaps no Parliamentary official who, in a subordinate way, can do so much mischief as the First Commissioner of Works, and Mr. AYRTON has certainly not neglected his opportunities. During his three years of office he has been successful in disorganizing and exasperating the departments under his charge in an almost incredible degree; and the scandalous muddle of the Park rules has now brought his career to an appropriate climax, which might also fitly be its close. The freakish despotism of RABAGAS in office is amusing on the stage, but the joke is less enjoyable in real life. It is possible that the patience of Parliament, if not of the Government, will now be exhausted. Personal grievances may be beneath the notice of the House of Commons, but a slight upon itself, which exposes its authority to contempt and creates a public danger, may be less easily overlooked or forgiven.

#### SANITARY OFFICERS.

THE regulations as to the appointment and duties of sanitary officers have been published by the Local Government Board. Under the Public Health Act every sanitary authority is bound to appoint a Medical Officer of Health and an Inspector of Nuisances. The Local Government Board has power consequently to insist upon this being done, and also to insist upon the performance by these officers of the duties imposed on them by statute. But it has no power to

do anything more. It cannot prescribe any particular qualification, or mode of appointment, or salary, or tenure of office. Upon all these matters the local authorities, so far as they are not controlled by Act of Parliament, are uncontrolled. Still the Local Government Board has not left itself without a means of leading the sanitary authorities in the direction in which it wishes them to go. It appeals to them through the gentle teachings of the pocket. It offers them half the salaries of the Medical Officer and the Inspector of Nuisances, on condition that it is allowed to have a paramount voice in appointing them and in setting out their duties. The regulations now published constitute the terms on which this subsidy may be obtained. A statement showing the population and extent of the district for which it is proposed to appoint a Medical Officer or an Inspector of Nuisances, and the salary which it is proposed to pay him, is first of all to be submitted to the Local Government Board; and in cases where it is desirable that one officer be appointed for two or more sanitary districts similar statements are to be submitted for each district. This is the most important stage of the process. The circular of the Board points out with great truth that the persons chosen for these appointments should be thoroughly qualified for their work; and that it will be impossible to secure this object "unless the salary which the authorities are enabled to offer 'is such as to afford an adequate remuneration for the services required.'" If each sanitary district is to appoint its own officers, the provision of this adequate remuneration will entail a considerable burden on the ratepayers. Even if the ratepayers are willing to submit to this burden, there is no certainty that they will get full worth for their money. A single parish often cannot furnish a really competent Medical Officer of Health. It would be necessary to go some way afield in order to find one. In proportion as sanitary areas are widened, the difficulty of getting a good Medical Officer, and the cost of paying him—so far as regards the ratepayers of each of the parishes included in the united district—are alike lessened. One great function of the Local Government Board will be to convince the local authorities of this, and to induce them to prefer a share in the services of well-paid and competent officers to the whole services of an ill-paid and incompetent officer. The battle will be virtually won when the limits of the district to be assigned to the Medical Officer are satisfactorily settled. The fact that several sanitary authorities have to combine in making the appointment will be a sufficient security against local favouritism, while the greater dignity and pay thereby conferred on the Medical Officer will tempt men of character and position in the district to offer themselves as candidates. It is not too much to say that the success of the Public Health Act largely depends on the power of uniting districts being extensively and judiciously exercised. The grouping of areas for sanitary purposes will not always be a very easy matter, and there is danger that when the local authorities have committed themselves to a particular scheme they may become wedded to it, and rather reject the idea of making joint appointments than submit to making them on a different principle from that suggested by themselves. The Local Government Board has prudently guarded against this by inviting the local authorities, before forwarding any joint scheme for approval, to "put themselves in communication with the Inspector of the 'Board for the District, who will be at their disposal for assisting in the requisite negotiations.'" The effect of this will be that the Local Government Board will be unofficially informed of the plans which are taking shape in the minds of the sanitary authorities in time to suggest modifications. It makes a great difference whether suggestions of this kind are made through a formal correspondence in which the Board demands that a scheme shall be altered, and the local authorities insist on maintaining it unaltered, or through an informal interview with the Inspector, in which he merely makes his larger experience available for the benefit of the local authorities in framing their scheme. In the former case the victory of the Local Government Board implies the absolute defeat of the local authorities. In the latter case it only implies that the scheme has been settled in conference between the two. Upon every point in the proposal of the local authorities the Government may have its say without any appearance of interfering with them, and consequently with a proportionate degree of security that it will not be suspected of interfering.

The duties imposed upon sanitary officers by the new regulations are sufficiently numerous. The Medical Officer is to inform himself respecting all influences which threaten the public health within his district; to inquire into the cause,

origin, and distribution of disease; to advise the sanitary authority upon all points connected with the sanitary condition of the district; in cases in which it may appear advisable, to inspect all articles of food which are suspected of being unfit for human food; to investigate into offensive trades; and to give information to the Local Government Board of any outbreak of epidemic disease. The duties of the Inspector of Nuisances are to make systematic inspections of his district, so as to keep himself informed of any nuisances requiring abatement; to visit and report upon any nuisances of the existence of which he has been informed; to report to the sanitary authority any noxious trades that may be set up within the district, or any fouling of water used for domestic purposes; to inspect, both systematically and upon complaint, all shops in which articles of food are sold, and to seize any such articles as appear to be unfit for the purpose, in order that the persons exposing them for sale may be dealt with by law; to procure samples of food to be submitted to the analyst appointed under the Adulteration of Food Act; and to inform the Medical Officer of the existence in the district either of epidemic disease or of nuisances injurious to health. In cases where these duties are entrusted to competent persons a very complete check will be maintained over sanitary mischiefs. The danger that the Inspector of Nuisances will be bribed by persons interested in keeping him silent will be avoided by the concurrent jurisdiction exercised by the Medical Officer; while the danger that the Medical Officer himself will be subjected to influences of the same kind will be removed by the professional standing which will naturally belong to a man of sufficient repute to be jointly appointed by several different authorities.

It remains to be seen how far the local authorities will be induced by the prospect of having half the salaries of their officers paid out of the Imperial revenue to fall in with the wishes of the Local Government Board. It may probably be taken as certain that the majority of them will do so without hesitation. It will be so clearly better, for example, that three sanitary districts should unite to pay a Medical Officer 150*l.* a year, the Local Government Board making up his salary to 300*l.*, than that these same parishes should pay 100*l.* a year each to three inferior men, the Local Government Board contributing nothing, that even the average ratepayer may in the end be trusted to take the right view of his representatives' duty in the matter. The sanitary authorities which may be expected to reject the offer of the Local Government Board are of two kinds—a few large towns, proud of their successful sanitary administration hitherto, and resenting anything that even looks like a suggestion from without; and districts in which, either from sheer obstinacy or from a corrupt desire to keep off prying eyes, the authorities prefer paying the whole salaries of incompetent officers to paying half the salaries of competent officers. As regards the former class no harm will come of their refusal. The regulations of the Local Government Board will form a standard by which the proceedings of sanitary authorities not subject to them may be judged, and there is not much fear but that towns of the character described will be eager to show that they can do more for the public health when left to themselves than if they had allowed the central authority to exercise a co-ordinate power in the appointment and control of their officers. As regards the latter, it must be remembered that the coercive powers of the Local Government Board are not affected by the issue of these regulations. If the sanitary authorities can be coaxed into doing their work efficiently, the new machinery will run far more smoothly. The isolation of the refractory authorities from the rest will tend to deprive them of the sympathy which might have been wasted on them if their opposition could have been confounded with any general resistance to centralization, and the fact that their opposition deprives them of the benefit of Government assistance, and that the persons who reap a profit from that opposition are a few rich men, will contribute to the enlightenment of the ratepayers. In this way sanitary improvement may even come to be a popular cry at municipal and rural elections.

#### MILLIONAIRES.

THE *Spectator* last week published a curious list of people who have died in England during the last ten years leaving more than a quarter of a million of personal property. The amounts thus given are, as the *Spectator* points out, a very inadequate representation of the fortunes actually enjoyed. The value of a business, for example, is generally understated; and of course there is no account of the landed property, which in many cases is much the largest part of the estates. It appears, however, that, even on this inadequate showing, there died in Great Britain within the stated time ten millionaires, 53 persons with



over half a million, and 161 with over a quarter of a million. Already, that is, we lose on an average a millionaire a year, and, as we know, the standard is rapidly rising. A man who would have been counted preposterously rich half a century ago has now nothing more than a respectable property. The nabobs of the last century who startled the propriety of the fashionable world by their demands for "more curricles" would hardly be able to hold up their heads as the magnates of a second-rate country town. The conditions which favoured the accumulation of these vast properties will in all probability become more developed as time goes on. As the commercial organization grows in complexity, the great reservoirs through which the currents of trade circulate become more gorged with wealth; and the fortunate persons who direct the stream acquire, in the gorgeous Johnsonian phrase, the potentiality of growing rich beyond the dreams of avarice. The possible fortunes of some of our descendants dazzle the imagination; and it is not surprising that moralists and social philosophers are alarmed by the consequences which they foresee. In England the most popular cry refers to the swallowing up of the soil by great landowners; and, whatever may be the facts, it is of course true that the possession by a few persons of a commodity which is at once absolutely necessary and strictly limited in amount has dangers not to be precisely paralleled by the accumulation of wealth which involves no such monopoly. But the growth of vast commercial fortunes may equally give rise to forebodings of danger. In America, where they are increasing at a rate still greater than with us, but where of course there is no danger of an absorption of the land by a few proprietors, we are beginning to see political and social changes never contemplated by Franklin, or Jefferson, or even by De Tocqueville. There seems to be a tendency to an alliance between the enormously rich and the demagogues, productive of dangerous corruption and of a new and questionable variety of plutocracy. We can only look on in amazement at the state of things which produced the Erie ring and the New York judiciary, and wonder what new developments may be in store for us. But for the present we would turn to a humbler line of inquiry and meditate briefly on the text which Clough expressed in the burden of his striking lyric, "How pleasant it is to have money, heigho! how pleasant it is to have money!" There may be dangers to the social order in the new condition of affairs; but, leaving them out of sight, we may consider a rich man as we should consider a beautiful work of art or a gorgeous hothouse flower. He is a new and strange product of our civilization, and demands the eye of a careful observer, for at present it would seem as if the position were so novel that these objects of our worship scarcely know themselves how to turn their position to account most gracefully.

In the long series of gradations from the pauper to the millionaire there are two great breaks. There is the line below which the workhouse and starvation are pressing realities to be taken into account in the plan of every day's life. And there is the line above which wealth becomes so enormous as to be rather an encumbrance than a luxury, and an increase of money rather imposes new duties than relieves from old anxieties. We have been preaching for many centuries as to the proper behaviour of the population below the first of these lines of demarcation; but the art of enjoying our wealth when we pass into the highest class is as yet insufficiently studied. Let us conceive of a man thoroughly but not grossly selfish, anxious to enjoy life to the dregs, but with a capacity for enjoyments of an intellectual and æsthetic nature. Let wealth rain in upon him till every ordinary want is satisfied and the labour even of spending becomes a serious consideration. Let him never take his hand from his pocket and return it without finding that a new handful of coin has fallen into it in the interval. Let him feel that he could, if he wished, paper his house with bank-notes and play ducks and drakes with diamonds. The contemplation of such a person from the outside is delightful to the imagination in all ages, as is proved by the *Arabian Nights* and *Lolhar*; and, though moralists have laboured to prove the emptiness of wealth, it may plausibly be urged that the pleasure which such a man gives to outsiders by mere existence is almost a justification of his wildest luxury. Observe a London crowd standing opposite the church-door when a grand wedding is taking place. There may be amongst them a sour socialist or two conceiving a brilliant passage for his night's discourse to his club, but the prevailing sentiment is that of simple, unadulterated, and unquestioning pleasure in the contemplation. The human being, entirely freed from all the rasping anxieties of poverty, able to develop his tastes and faculties to the fullest extent without the smallest external pressure, is a delightful object in himself. We regard him as an object of natural luxury, like an ornament on a chimney-piece or a carved and gilded figure-head on a ship. He is the elaborate final on the summit of the social edifice, the flower that we carry in our button-holes, or the triumphant flourish in the great chorus—too often a sadly depressing chorus—of humanity.

It is more difficult to say how the man himself, as seen from within, may be brought to correspond to his external aspect. Sydney Smith, or some philosopher of the same school, has declared that the happiest of all conditions in life is to possess twenty thousand a year and to be generally supposed to possess ten thousand. The erroneous estimate prevents all unpleasant demands, whilst it is urged that twenty thousand a year is as much as a man can spend on his own personal enjoyment. For that sum—or some such sum, for of course the figures vary from year to year—he can have as good housing, clothes, meat, and drink as he need wish to have,

and can see as much good society and treat himself to as many pleasures of a refined kind as can be enjoyed by his own ears, eyes, nose, and palate. When the limit is distinctly exceeded, he becomes more or less a slave to his own magnificence. He has flunkys ruling over him with a rod of iron; he has palaces and pictures to be kept up for the public benefit on pain of being considered niggardly; and he can no longer enjoy a quiet holiday trip by himself, but must travel like a prince, hampered by a courier and victimized by the officious attentions of innkeepers. The difficulty is of course a real one, but it is by no means insoluble. That a man should be thought poorer than he is is certainly an advantage, whether he is an applicant for parochial relief or a millionaire. To have 100,000*l.* a year and to be supposed to have only 50,000*l.* might be a very tolerable condition for a man of moderate tastes. But the difficulty of spending satisfactorily sums beyond a certain limit merely indicates the importance of training a man for wealth. Poor Mrs. Baker, who appealed to Sir R. Malins the other day, is a melancholy instance of an old truth. She managed in the course of six years to throw away the whole fortune of 100,000*l.* which had accidentally come to her, and apparently got nothing whatever for her money. The ingenious Mr. Loader, who induced her to hand over to him the balance of some 10,000*l.*, which was all that she possessed after two years, and who allowed her 100*l.* a year as full payment, was doubtless a rogue, and the order for restitution was inevitable. But we may doubt whether, on the whole, Mr. Loader did not allow Mrs. Baker as much as she could spend upon herself to any advantage. What could a poor old lodging-house keeper do with an income of 5,000*l.* a year? When she had made her cat thoroughly comfortable, and had a meat supper every night, she had probably reached the limit of imaginable luxury. It was simply the old story of poor Tittlebat Titmouse over again; and with all its intolerable snobbishness that work had a moral after its kind. To spend very large sums of money on your own comfort requires forethought, care, and training; but we see no reason why any fixed limits should be assigned to human ingenuity in that direction. Undoubtedly an increase of income ceases to yield proportional results after a very short time. The first hundred a year which lifts you above the risk of the workhouse confers a much greater benefit than the addition of a thousand a year when you have already the hundred, or of twenty thousand when you have the one thousand. But we may venture to say that there is no man so rich that he could not succeed in adding something to his own personal comfort. The *Spectator*, which takes rather an optimistic view of the subject, makes the suggestion that the increase of great fortunes is favourable to the national taste. Rich men, it seems, are at the present day too sagacious to be taken in after the old foolish fashion. They really learn to be good judges of pictures, china, gems, or books; and thus have a practically unlimited field of expenditure, which affords them at every step the pleasures known to the connoisseur. Our contemporary proceeds to add, which is more doubtful, that our national taste has been improved in consequence. That we think our taste has improved is certain; but that is really saying no more than that we prefer our taste to the taste of our fathers, or that, in other words, our taste is our taste. Whether, in fact, modern art is superior, say, to that of the last century, is another question, which, considering how many people endeavour to imitate the bygone fashions, must at present be regarded as open. And, moreover, taste in this direction is developed in the rich at the cost of other classes. The prices of all kinds of beautiful things have risen so greatly of late years that it is far more difficult than it was for a moderately rich man to gratify his taste. In some cases all that has happened has been that rich men, with little knowledge, have bought up objects which were formerly in the possession of poorer people who appreciated them as highly, but could not afford to pay modern prices. When old china or furniture happens to become the fashion, it is at once raised altogether beyond the grasp of people in the middle classes; but the change may not indicate that the article is really more admired, but simply that there is more money to pay for it. However this may be, we fully admit that a man who will plunge into expenditure of this kind need scarcely be embarrassed by any amount of wealth. By a happy compensation, prices naturally rise as wealth increases; and the pictures bought by an old collector, such as Sir Robert Walpole, would now, if attainable at all, fetch sums which would tax the purse of the enormously wealthier class who have taken Walpole's place in the country. Here, then, without having recourse to gambling on the turf, or speculating in finance, a rich man may find in his wealth the means of cultivating his taste, and so opening new sources of pleasure beyond any assignable limit. Perhaps a profuse expenditure in such matters is run to be demoralizing to the recipients, and successful artists run a greater risk of being spoilt than they formerly did of being starved. That, however, is beside the immediate question. We only assert that a gentleman who deliberately regards himself as a social butterfly, a being intended to diffuse pleasure simply by displaying his gorgeous hues to all observers, may find the means of getting rid of any quantity of money, to the gratification of himself and others.

There is a different plan, which is perhaps rather more troublesome, and more immoral. To spend vast sums on charity when you cannot possibly miss them is agreeable in itself, and, if it were not for its pernicious consequences, might be safely recommended. The poor increase as well as the rich; and by throwing away large sums in the manufacture of paupers, you may not only spend as

much as you choose, but may acquire one of the most exquisite of human pleasures, by being the object of universal flattery. It is pleasant to have the reputation of being a philanthropist because you only spend on your personal enjoyments some fifty or sixty thousand a year. To the man of tender conscience this source of pleasure is indeed closed, but with sufficient care an alternative may be discovered which is free from this objection. A man may spend money in a public-spirited way without doing more harm than good, difficult as the problem appears at first sight. Rich men in America have lately taken to founding universities and museums and libraries with a munificence worthy of the national turn for liberality. Luckily, too, we have examples nearer home of methods of splendid expenditure which are calculated to make poor people happier, and to encourage in them some taste for refined enjoyment without injuring their spirit of independence. Such modes of expenditure are excellent in themselves, and it is highly desirable that they should become more common, if only that they may act as charms to avert the evil eye with which our paupers are apt occasionally to regard our millionaires. The necessary antidote to the spread of socialism is the spread of public spirit, which proves that the art of being wealthy requires assiduous cultivation for more reasons than one. It is very desirable that people who suffer from a plethora of wealth should be taught how to enjoy themselves under these melancholy circumstances, when wealth like madness threatens to prevail more widely than of old; and it is also desirable that their tastes should take a direction calculated to meet that pang of jealousy which strikes most of us, even when we are not paupers, on reading a list of hundreds of millionaires.

#### MR. FROUDE'S CONFESSION.

WE are, we think we may say without undue pride, fairly old stagers in the art of criticism. But some of our brethren altogether take us aback. There clearly are some branches of our art which we have not learned. We have all heard of the two lovers who prayed the Gods to annihilate both time and space in order to make their two selves happy. Some critics seem to be able to do in their own strength what the lovers looked on as at least needing the help of the Gods. We cannot review a book till we have read it, and we cannot read through a thick volume on a serious subject in an hour or in a day. Yet people are, and have been for days and weeks past, reviewing the single volume which has as yet appeared of Mr. Froude's book about Ireland. Such speed is beyond us. We will do our best to give our readers our thoughts on Mr. Froude's book the first moment we find ourselves in a fit state to do so. But we shall not be in a fit state to put forth any thoughts about Mr. Froude till we have found out what are his thoughts about the matter which he has taken in hand. Still, not to be altogether behind the world, to comply with the fashion which demands that we should be saying something or other about Mr. Froude's book, we will make bold to put out our thoughts on the only part of the book which as yet we have thoroughly mastered. This is the fly-leaf. And Mr. Froude's fly-leaf, at all events the one at the end of the volume, is certainly as well worth studying as anything that he ever wrote. It contains an advertisement of the last edition of Mr. Froude's History of England. And in that advertisement Mr. Froude takes us all into his confidence, and tells us when, how, and why his History was written. The confession is very curious and instructive, and we hope our readers will take some remarks on it as a kind of sop till we can, at our slow pace, make our way towards saying something about the Irish volume itself.

The advertisement of which we speak sets before us, with a perfect ingenuousness which does Mr. Froude all credit, the causes which led him to write his History of England. The causes are pretty much what we should have looked for. Mr. Froude in fact tells us, in his own words and on his own authority, what we have often said in our words as a matter of *a priori* speculation. We have often said—judging from the book itself—that Mr. Froude did not set to work to write history because he had given his life to the study of history, and because he had found one particular portion of history which best suited his own bent, one of which he felt himself most thoroughly master, and on which he felt a call to throw what light he was able. We have often said that it was plain that Mr. Froude had rushed at one particular part of history without any general historical training, without even thoroughly mastering the earlier history of the particular country of which he proposed dealing with one of the later stages. The latter part was better than the earlier, because, when he wrote the earlier part, he knew nothing at all of the times before those of which he was writing; whereas, when he came to write about the later times, he had, in the process of writing his book, learned a great deal about the times which went before them. In short, Mr. Froude's book showed us that he did not write out of simple love for historical truth, but for some other cause, be it what it might. And now he tells us with his own mouth that everything was exactly as we knew that it must have been. He wrote, not because he loved history, not because he had studied history, but because he wanted something to do, and because certain theological controversies were going about. "The occasion of undertaking the present work was, as regards myself, an involuntary leisure forced upon me by my inability to pursue the profession which I had entered, but

which I was forbidden by the law to exchange for another." The real student, who has been at the thing all his life and has pretty well forgotten what the word "leisure" means, will smile at the picture of Mr. Froude with his time hanging heavy on his hands, casting about for something to fill up the dreary vacant hours, and at last hitting on the history of England in the sixteenth century as a pastime which might save him from the weariness of utter idleness. Mr. Froude then was driven by his involuntary leisure to do something, and the particular thing which he did was settled for him by the controversies of the time. It was—Mr. Froude, as is perhaps becoming in an advertisement, talks a little in the grand style—"the attitude towards the Revolution of the sixteenth century which had been assumed by many influential thinkers in England and on the Continent." Goethe had said one thing about Luther and Calvin; Lord Macaulay had said another thing about Cranmer; High Churchmen had said this; Liberal statesmen had said that; altogether the B. Reformation seemed in rather a bad way. Especially "it had become the fashion to speak with extreme severity of the persecution of the Catholics under Elizabeth." It would seem to have been the hardest cut of all in Mr. Froude's eyes that influential thinkers, High Churchmen, Liberal statesmen, or anybody else, should speak with severity of a persecution. Mr. Froude on the other hand had an "impression about" the Reformation, that "it was both a good thing in itself, and that in England it had been accomplished with peculiar skill and success." As he was so offended with the fashion of speaking against Elizabeth's persecutions, one may be allowed to guess that part of the skill and success which he admired was the skill and success with which Elizabeth's executioners, in the vivid phrase of Lord Macaulay, "grabbed in the entrails" of those who sinned against the Queen's ecclesiastical laws.

Mr. Froude, then, proposed to himself to study, and seemingly to write, the History of the Reformation, in order to set these matters straight. But the way in which he at first purposed to set about it was rather a strange one. "My original purpose was to confine myself to the reign of the great Queen for whom, looking to the spirit in which her government had been conducted, I felt great admiration." He was further to "undertake the vindication of her personal purity against Lingard and others." "With Cranmer," he adds, "and his companions, unwilling as I was to accept Lord Macaulay's judgment upon them, I proposed not to meddle." That is to say, he really carried the notion of beginning a thing in the middle even further than we had fancied. We easily saw that he had begun Henry the Eighth with very little knowledge of the times before Henry the Eighth; but it really did not come into our head, till Mr. Froude told us himself, that he ever thought of doing Elizabeth without doing Henry the Eighth. One would really like to know how he had fancied that it would be possible to deal with the Reformation as settled by Elizabeth and Parker without "meddling" with that earlier stage of the Reformation which is represented by "Cranmer and his companions." And who are Cranmer and his companions? Our guess is that by Cranmer's companions Mr. Froude means those who happened to be burned as well as Cranmer himself. But surely there may be a companionship with Cranmer in other things besides burning. The men who happened not to be burned, those who got away into foreign lands, or who, like Cecil and Parker, contrived to live through Mary's reign without being either burned or banished, were surely companions of Cranmer as well as those who were less lucky or more steadfast. Mr. Froude is unconsciously influenced by a temptation which it is always very hard wholly to get rid of—namely, that when we get to any marked stage in history, such as the accession of Elizabeth undoubtedly was, everything starts quite fresh with a new set of men. Parker was a younger man than Cranmer, but Parker belongs to the reign of Henry the Eighth just as much as Cranmer does; and Cranmer, had he not been burned, would have belonged to the reign of Elizabeth just as much as Parker does. There is never any time when history stops still and begins again. A history of Elizabeth in which Cranmer and his companions were not meddled with would have been a curiosity indeed. We are almost tempted to wish that Mr. Froude had carried out his work according to the model which he had at first intended.

Mr. Froude however soon found that his first model would not do. "I found myself, however, unable to handle the later features of the Revolution without going back to the beginning of it." *πῶς γὰρ οὐ;* one cannot help honouring Mr. Froude for the candour of his avowal, but neither can we help wondering at the state of mind which could ever have expected anything else—*μακαρίζοντες ὑμῶν τὸ ἀπειροκακὸν οὐ ζηλοῦμεν τὸ ἄρρον.* "The coming of the Armada was the last act of a drama of which the divorce of Queen Catharine was the first." We might be inclined to put on a few more acts at each end. We might spread out our drama from the King who refused to do homage to Hildebrand, perhaps from the Earl who defied Nicolas, to the Parliament which decreed that no Popish King should rule over England. But never mind; it is pleasing to see how the new light gradually breaks on Mr. Froude's mind, even with his narrower range. He found out that he could not understand the latter stages of a thing unless he understood the beginning. "I was thus led to study more closely, and then to undertake the narrative of the entire period between the original quarrel with the Papacy and the point at which the separation of England from the Roman communion was finally decided." It is indeed a revelation from the Palace of Truth when we find a man who tells us that there was a time when he thought that he could "handle the later features of the



Reformation" without studying as closely as he could the entire period from the original quarrel with the Papacy.

Mr. Froude then goes on to tell us how, in the course of his close study, he came to think differently about some things from what he thought when he began. Such changes are a result which is pretty certain to follow upon close study. But in Mr. Froude's case the amount of change seems to have been greater than it might perhaps have been if he had been used to close study from the beginning, instead of merely taking to it as an escape from involuntary leisure. He tells us that, before he began to study more closely, he "shared the prevailing views of the character of Henry the Eighth," but "a qualified defence of Henry the Eighth was forced upon him by the facts of the case." It was not, we think, so much by the facts of the case as by an influence which with one who, like Mr. Froude, had only just begun his close studies was by no means unnatural. It needs a very long practice to get the sort of tact by which we feel how far a public document may be trusted and how far it may be not. Mr. Froude had quite acuteness enough to see the value of State Papers, Acts of Parliament, and other official writings. He had not familiarity enough with the historical documents of other times to know when they could not be trusted. Had Mr. Froude begun his studies at the beginning, and had he got to Henry the Eighth in due course of time, he would have found out that the same line of argument by which he went about to set up Henry the Eighth would lead to some very strange conclusions in other parts of history. If we were to go by the language of Yorkist Acts of Parliament, we might think that poor Henry the Sixth was one of the most dangerous of tyrants, while there is nothing in the formal language of the Great Charter to show that King John was other than one of the most well-disposed of our Kings. Mr. Froude goes on to say:—

With equal reluctance I had to acknowledge that the wisdom of Elizabeth was the wisdom of her Ministers, and that her chief merit, which circumstances must divide with herself, lay in allowing her policy to be guided by Lord Burghley.

Now we are far from wholly going along with Mr. Froude in his depreciation of Queen Elizabeth, but we fully allow that he has made out a better case against her than he has made out for her father. And no wonder; for when Mr. Froude got to the reign of Elizabeth, he had gained a much greater knowledge of history and a much greater practice in writing it than he had when he began his studies with Henry the Eighth. As for "circumstances dividing merit with Queen Elizabeth," that is rather too much in the grand style for us easily to take it in. But we freely allow that in one sense the wisdom of Elizabeth was the wisdom of her Ministers; but in another sense the wisdom of her Ministers was the wisdom of Elizabeth, because she had the wisdom to choose those wise Ministers. The Sovereign who, in a state of things when Kings can freely choose their Ministers for themselves, chooses a wise Minister, and keeps him to the end of his days, shows no small sign of wisdom on his own part. Under how many Sovereigns before or after Elizabeth would Burghley have kept the place which he kept under her? Under her father we strongly suspect that some good reason would have been found sooner or later for sending him on the same journey as More and Cromwell.

On one point Mr. Froude makes an apology which is not needed—namely, the length to which his book has grown. As far as mere length goes, we do not think his History a page too long. But when he goes on to say in his defence that nine-tenths of the material which he has used was in manuscript, and therefore difficult of access, we are reminded of a certain sense of mistrust which, in reading his book, we constantly feel because of the nature of his materials. Whenever we can test Mr. Froude by a plain piece of English or Latin, say Camden or Sir Symonds D'Ewes, we always find his quotations so very unlike what we find in our printed book, that we are always followed about by an uneasy feeling as to his copying or translation of the manuscript materials which we have no chance of seeing. We will remind our readers of one instance only, partly because it comes very near the end of the book, and partly because it is as a matter of fact utterly unimportant, while it is to us altogether inconceivable how such an accident could have happened to any one who had read and copied his books with common accuracy. When we find in Mr. Froude's text a ship bearing so queer a name as the "Ark Raleigh," and we turn to our Camden and find that in his text it is "Arca Regalis," we cannot wholly keep down our doubts as to things which we are asked to believe on the authority of manuscripts which are so far off as Simancas.

#### DINNERS IN THE PROVINCES.

WE are often told that the privileges of the landed interest are excessive, and that each succeeding year tends to exalt the position which it enjoys. The possession of acres gives its peculiar advantages. The country proprietor may look forward to seeing his name on the Commission of the Peace, and may dream of some day being mistaken for a General at a foreign Court when attired in the resplendent uniform of a Deputy-Lieutenant. In the Midland counties his tenants will take off their hats when they meet him. He may choose any known or unknown animal to represent the device his ancestors wore when setting out for the Crusades; and his wife can patronize the local bazaar,

and may possibly be asked to the Yeomanry ball. This is the bright side of the picture, but, great and indubitable as are the advantages we have described, there are hideous responsibilities connected with the tenure of land, which the auctioneer takes no count of, and which sit behind both Lord and Deputy Lieutenants. When a man has "a stake in the country," whatever that may be, his opinions attain a certain importance, and he is expected to lose no opportunity of declaring them. This is the time of year when the opportunity occurs, and throughout the months of November and December innumerable banquets and dinners give birth to the beautiful speeches which are reported in the local newspapers. To speak—that is to say, to utter words belonging to the English language, and endeavour to apply them to a given subject—seems impossible in cold blood. Meat and alcohol are required to stimulate the nerves to the desired pitch, while the harmony of knives and spoons cheers the speaker as he shows what quaint combinations the English tongue is capable of. The object of the meeting has but little effect in determining the complexion of the entertainment. Everything resolves itself into eating and drinking. The birth of a child, the marriage of an heir, the presentation of a thing of ugliness to be a sorrow on some sideboard for ever, the success of an agricultural association, the formation of a Company to enlist the sympathies of the public on behalf of decayed and indigent mice to protect them against their natural enemies the cats, the desire to do honour to Mr. Cobden, or the resignation of some one who has retired a few years after the loss of all his faculties has overtaken him—all these offer a curious similarity in the mode in which they are celebrated. Some day is fixed upon which a dinner is to take place in the neighbouring town, at a sufficiently remote period to cause the engagement to dwell as a nightmare upon the minds of the invited guests. When the day arrives it displays in a remarkable degree what inconveniences Englishmen are ready from a sense of duty or custom to submit to. The hour is probably an abnormal one, to enable some one to miss a late train; the chairman is probably unpunctual, and the guests flit about a cold and dismal ante-room; those who are dressed in evening clothes are vaguely conscious of their peculiarity, while the frock-coated tribe of men are engaged in counting their numbers, hoping to lose their self-consciousness in a sense of their own preponderance. At intervals they cross the room, as if they had some purpose to fulfil, then hurriedly turn back, and subside nervously into a corner. All the professions are represented; there is the squire who has driven seven miles in a dogcart, and shakes hands as if hands had no sensations. There are clergymen and doctors. Why the health of the medical profession is not drunk at these gatherings we do not know; perhaps that of the county members might be omitted for a few years to create a vacancy, during which interval they might devote themselves to the composition of a speech on the expiration of the Ballot in 1880. There are several reporters, though why they should take the trouble to leave their homes it is not easy to guess. What could be simpler than to write in peace in their own rooms that the Queen was a good Queen, that the Prince of Wales had been ill but was better again, and that no county sympathized more than that particular county; that the bishop of the diocese was too well known to need commendation, and that the clergy were zealous in the performance of their duties; that the House of Lords was a valuable institution, which was evinced by the fact that Mr. Roebuck had changed his mind on that subject, and that his pamphlet had never sold; that the House of Commons was a popular Assembly, and was the exponent of the will of the people; that the county and borough representatives were not indifferent to the interests of their constituencies; that the Mayor was a civic functionary; and that they themselves, the representatives of the press, were an important body of gentlemen. It would be very strange if this stereotyped summary were not sufficient to content the public.

When the food is cold the dinner begins. The room is a very cavern of the winds, and every seat has its own window open behind it. Men tumble into a wrong place to retain it, into a right place to vacate it. Pillars of Church and State group themselves near the chairman, mostly of middle age, for public dinners make men prematurely old, trying the mind as well as the digestion. "You will find excellent bread, meat, and wine, provided you bring them with you," was the inscription on the wall of the Swedish inn, and it applies with equal force to the provincial dinner. Before the fish has been taken off the table the future speaker may be detected. His vacillating appetite, trembling hands, and wandering thoughts all point to one disturbing cause; his lips form vaguely a "Mr. Chairman, my Lords and Gentlemen," after which all is a blank. Perhaps matters would improve if only his neighbour would keep quiet; but with ceaseless activity he gabbles throughout dinner, and confusion becomes worse confounded. Misguided mortal! he does not venture to write down his vagaries upon the piece of paper he has brought with him, and the only point that had occurred to him he has already forgotten. Joints follow entrées, and entremets joints; the time becomes shorter and shorter, and no God intervenes to postpone the dreaded ordeal, and shed darkness over the whole scene. He would willingly give up his stake in the country on the condition that he should never again be asked to propose the army and navy of England. He has drunk his neighbour's wine from fright, and, when the cloth is taken away, he sees a troop of sisters, daughters, and wives rushing into the gallery. They have come to enjoy their rights, and see what a grand creature man is; how he shouts when he has nothing to say, how he mutters, how he

stops, rubs his hand, twists his watch-chain, surveys his boots, appeals frantically to the chairman, begins it all over again like a boy saying his lesson, proceeds glibly into the middle of a quotation never to get to the end, mistakes noise for cheering, commits himself to a noun, a verb, and an epithet, and then finds he has achieved a combination which nothing in the English language will harmonize with; kind friends around each suggest a word; but as nonsense the sentence began, and as nonsense it must end. Labouring under the absurd impression that he has something to say, the speaker will not sit down, and manages to convey to every one else the feeling of exquisite pain from which he is himself suffering. It is indeed the audience which is to be sympathized with quite as much as the orator; other exhibitions of a cognate kind may create amusement, but failure in public speaking is the death's head at the Egyptian banquet, reminding the guests that they are mortal. The unhappy senator who rises to return thanks for the House of Lords must deem it very hard that an enormous income and the obsequiousness of scores of neighbours are of no avail whatever in prompting the consecutive utterance of a few platitudes.

To make certain of the permanence of this branch of our Constitution, or at least to enhance its value, an easy plan might be adopted. Let one night be devoted unanimously by Government and the Opposition to the cultivation of their followers, four or five hours be given to the proposal of common toasts, such as Mr. Bruce's force of character and Mr. Ayrton's courtesy, and Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Bernal Osborne retained specially as teachers. Diplomats would thus in a very few years be given to several legislatures to the effect that they were quite competent to return thanks for their health in the provinces, were able to gesticulate with grace, and to remember their names when on their legs. The public, mindful of the great gain likely to ensue, would not insist upon publicity being given to the course of teaching, or upon being present itself during the performances we have suggested. We should not wish to deprive the county members of these advantages. Column after column is occupied by statements of theirs in which there is hardly ever a suggestion of any merit. The "cow and his labourer" is the subject round which their minds revolve, some of them apparently believing that this cry is the panacea of the age. If a labourer has a large and well-built cottage, a provident wife, a small family, the habit of accumulation, of judiciously investing his savings, and behaves with perfect propriety in all the relations of life, it is not unlikely that he may prosper. If, on the other hand, he marries at the age of twenty, has a family of ten children, is dirty, improvident, and drunken, the possession of all the stock of Chaucer's poor widow, with the same rights over the adjacent common, will not enable him to lead a creditable life. At present the position is an instructive one. The farmers wish to claim for improvements which they have never made, and to see their rents unalterable; the labourers to let two rooms to lodgers and occupy the third themselves, to be perfectly reckless, and suffer no consequences, to shake off the feudal respect, but to retain the feudal advantages. The landlords, on the other hand, are desirous, if possible, of not spending more than a third of their incomes upon repairs, and would be only too glad to see their cottage property in the hands of small freeholders—property which, before the Ballot Act of this year, conferred some political power, but is now one of the heaviest of the taxes upon land. According to the nature of the dinner will be the character of the remarks. In one place the farmers will be congratulated upon the absence of an "agitator," the real cause probably being that the whole district has been under water for two months. The labourers will receive advice, flattery, threats, and good wishes alternately, and if nobody is any better for it, at any rate nobody is the worse. A few truisms are very effective, such as that if the labourer had more money and more leisure he would be better off, that no interest can stand alone, and that the question is a difficult one and requires elucidation. In such a genial manner the dinner is protracted until ten o'clock, when about thirty speeches have been made, and the farmers separate crying with one accord, in the words of Tacitus, that the evening has been spent "*pro dignitate rerum ad utilitatem temporum cum voluptate audientium*." The Company has been formed, the anniversary celebrated, the testimonial presented, the resignation accepted, and nothing is left save many idle words vainly endeavouring to find some application.

We should like to know what effect the study of our institutions produces upon the intelligent foreigner. The Japanese Ambassadors have been conducted over everything that smokes, and everything that smells, and we see that they were present at a public dinner a few weeks ago. If only his Excellency Sioni Iwakura could be induced to confide his impressions to a modern Montesquieu or Goldsmith, the criticisms of a real Usbek would enlighten us. Of course we have no doubt about the nature of those criticisms, and believe that the first thing that the Embassy will represent as necessary to the stability and happiness of the Japanese Empire is a centre of commercial industry. When class animosities have been judiciously stimulated, the atmosphere darkened, the rivers polluted, chronic noise produced and beauty banished, an emporium of trade will have been created, and the Embassy, when desired to name the channel which the recognition of their services shall take, will unanimously choose a public dinner.

## JUDICIOUS KICKING.

"B." the father of three sons, has written to the *Times* to say that, unless the big boys at Winchester School are allowed to thrash the little boys as much as they like, he shall not send his own boys—who are little boys—to that school any more. The only advantage, he holds, of sending your son to a well-managed public school is that he is sure to be "properly kicked" there, and on this kicking his salvation in after-life depends. "There is," he says, "a certain amount of small, petty meanness and selfish egotism, and want of consideration for others, in the best of boys, and, if they have not the privilege of being 'judiciously' kicked at school, the consequence is that they either have to administer the operation to themselves in after-life, under circumstances of great and almost insuperable difficulty, or to go without it." There is, we admit, a difficulty more or less physical in adult males kicking themselves properly, but we are not disposed to take quite such a desponding view as "B." does of the hopelessness of their condition. We have known people who, even when grown up, contrived to get other people to kick them. Besides, "B." unless shockingly lazy, or paralytic, or given over to the wearing of nothing but patent-leather boots, might do his duty to his family in this way himself. Perhaps, however, as is sometimes the case with very ferocious people, he is afraid of his wife. To some extent we are disposed to agree with "B." that judicious kicking is not at all a bad thing either for young or old, and in fact, in a strictly moral and metaphorical sense, we occasionally out of pure benevolence do a little in that way ourselves. The controversy, however, into which "B." has rushed relates not to judicious, but to injudicious, kicking. The question would seem to be whether a big boy is entitled to bruise and lacerate a little boy with brutal ferocity, entirely at his own discretion, and practically with impunity. The first and most natural impulse of a father who learned that his son had been treated in this manner would be, we imagine, to invest in a good stock of "ground ashes," and to "go for"—American is the fashionable language nowadays—the Prefect, and perhaps the Head-master too, by the next train. On reflection, however, it might occur to him that this course of action would have the effect of bringing him before the justices, and he might not unreasonably prefer to go before the justices of his own accord, and in another capacity. The father of a boy who was abominably ill-used at Winchester the other day made a great mistake in not immediately summoning the Prefect before the magistrates. The Head-master of the school has, it appears, suggested to the Governors that they should inquire into the matter; but it is not yet known whether the Governors will adopt the suggestion, and in any case we should, without disparagement to anybody, prefer a public inquiry in an open court.

The circumstances of the case out of which this controversy has arisen are these:—A "good and gentle boy"—we use the Head-master's language—fell upon a "good and nice boy," and belaboured him in the most savage manner with "ground ash" cudgels. A "ground ash" is described as a thick, tough sapling of from three to four feet long, and thirty cuts were inflicted with such vigour that there was quite a litter of saplings after the execution. According to one calculation four cudgels were broken over the poor little wretch's back, but the victim himself has since stated that a cudgel lasts only for three or four strokes, and this would bring up the number used to nine or ten. It will be admitted that, whether judicious or injudicious, deserved or undeserved, this was rather a severe punishment; but it is well known at Winchester, where it is called "tunding." This expression is part of the slang vocabulary, or "notions," of the school, and it was because the Prefect thought his victim was not sufficiently well up in this important branch of knowledge that he cudgelled him in this vigorous manner. Somebody has taken the trouble to compile a vocabulary of this slang, and after reading it we feel what a priceless advantage it must be in after-life to have had such elegant and useful learning kicked and cudgelled into one at school. If any proof of this were wanted, we should only have to point to the woolsack. Lord Selborne was educated at Winchester, and Lord Selborne is now the Lord High Chancellor of England. In early life there may have been many days when he could neither sit, nor stand, nor lie with comfort, and the woolsack is a peculiarly appropriate reward for his youthful sufferings. The Chancellor of the Exchequer's brilliant powers were also stimulated in early life by a proper allowance of "biblers" and "tundings." The slang of Winchester appears to be highly suggestive of the kind of discipline which is enforced in that establishment. The novice who has to get it by heart is no doubt taught by experience to discriminate nicely between "clows" and "cons," "boners" and "greases," "scrubbings," "biblers," and "tundings." The uninitiated may perhaps be gratified to learn that a "boner" is a blow with the fist on the lowest vertebra; that a "rabbiter" is a blow on the neck similar to the *coup de grâce* given by a keeper to put a rabbit out of misery; a "scrubbing," a flogging of four cuts; a "bibler," six cuts; and a "tunding," a trouncing with an unlimited number of ash cudgels. It will be readily understood that, when a Prefect has taken (perhaps we should say given) great pains to instruct a youngster in this noble tongue, it is very unkind of the youngster not to pass a creditable examination in it. It may be presumed that the victim in this case knows now what a "tunding" is. It is admitted, however, by everybody concerned, that the lesson was rather overdone: and Dr.



Ridding, the Head-master, is sorry that the "good and gentle boy" should "have allowed his zeal for discipline to have so far outrun his discretion"; which would seem to be a euphemism for saying that it is a pity the "good and gentle" boy did not reflect that if he went on beating his victim he might perhaps harm him for life or do him some other serious injury. Dr. Ridding acknowledges that it was "a very grave error of judgment to inflict such an extreme punishment," and that the Prefect "had rendered himself liable to pains and penalties." Dr. Ridding's letter to the *Times*, which is about one of the most wonderful specimens of English composition we ever remember to have read, is unfortunately vague and confused, especially as to dates. We gather, however, that it was not until after the victim's father had made a formal complaint that Dr. Ridding went so far as to ask the "good and gentle boy," in a strictly private interview, to say to the "good and nice boy" that he regretted "having exceeded what was right in the amount of punishment." Dr. Ridding did not think it necessary to ask the Prefect to make this apology before the school, though he notified it to "the Master of the victim's house," or to punish him in any other way. It is difficult to understand why, if a Prefect has made himself liable to "pains and penalties," they should not be enforced in his case just as they would be in the case of any other boy.

We have no hesitation in saying that this correspondence is not creditable to the management of the school. We know nothing of the facts except from what has appeared in the newspapers; and it is of course possible that the complexion of the affair may be altered by evidence adduced in the inquiry which Dr. Ridding has suggested. Dr. Ridding admits that the punishment was excessive. Nobody denies it. The victim's opinion that, though excessive, there was no tyranny or brutality in the punishment, would seem to show only that, after the licking, there was very little spirit left in him. The Head-master's evidence on this point is quite conclusive. He confesses that to his knowledge a big boy subjected a little boy to unjustifiable ill-usage, and that he thought it unnecessary or inexpedient to inflict on the big boy the "pains and penalties" to which, by the rules of the school, he had made himself liable. The discipline of the Prefects must be maintained at whatever cost to little boys. Head-masters, we know, are very great people. They live in a higher atmosphere than common folk, "on the hills, like gods together, careless of mankind," especially of mankind on the junior forms. It ought not perhaps to be expected that they should withdraw their minds from subjects of lofty contemplation to consider whether a small boy has been too much beaten. And yet parents, we imagine, are unreasonable enough to expect it. We are not of those who, because a system is liable to abuse, demand that it shall be utterly abolished. For flogging and for monitorial supervision there is no doubt much to be said. There is a good deal of nonsense in most lads which requires, not to put too fine a point on it, to be knocked out of them. It is undoubtedly a great advantage to a boy to find his level in the rough discipline of a public school, to learn to give and take, to hold his own ground as far as he can, but to recognize good-naturedly and without sourness the superiority of others, to take a thrashing pleasantly, and to have his conceit, priggishness, and childish egotism rubbed out of him by hard contact with a little world which is very like the big world through which he will afterwards have to push his way. For the system there may be much to be said; but for the abuses, for the patent, notorious, admitted abuses of the system, there should surely be a remedy. The Head-master's decision, of which the other masters are eager to express their unqualified approval, would seem to show that a Prefect is practically at liberty to chastise a boy to any extent which the caprice of temper of the moment may suggest. Theoretically there are "pains and penalties" provided for such an excess of zeal, but the Head-master does not enforce them. We can hardly suppose that such an incident as this is a familiar occurrence at Winchester. It would seem to be incredible that English parents should knowingly expose their sons to such brutal and tyrannical treatment; for, to our thinking, the tyranny is worse even than the brutality. If the practice were common, hints of it would leak out. It may be doubted whether lads of eighteen are fit to be trusted at all with the power of inflicting corporal punishment on their juniors, but at least they should be closely watched in the exercise of their authority, and any cruelty should be promptly punished. It may also be suggested that the primary object of the organization of a public school should not be to save the masters trouble, and to relieve them from responsibility. Whatever may be said for judicious kicking, there should at least be some security against an injudicious and excessive application of what, in a moderate dose, may be a salutary discipline.

#### THE WELLINGTON ESSAYISTS ON INFANTRY TACTICS.

WHEN we reviewed Lieutenant Maurice's Prize Essay on its first appearance (*Saturday Review*, August 17), we pointed out that the laborious care which he had taken to examine and set forth the ideas of the German school from which he draws his inspiration had led to a diffuseness that somewhat clouded his results. It is not, however, difficult to see that he aims above all at a larger independence of the whole military hierarchy, leading to that "greater manœuvring facility" without acquiring which our army must remain limited

to the defensive. To assert the need of this facility is, in fact, the object of many elaborate pages of his thoughtful work, and great part of what is there said applies especially to the future management of our infantry, for which he rightly indicates that the guide must lie in the study of recent contests. We shall now show that the same necessity has impressed itself with equal force on every one of his chief competitors; and as we last week pointed out that among those thus chosen, not merely the line, but every separate branch of the military service, is represented, it will be apparent that it is no mere fancy, no love for dogma, nor worship of success, that leads Mr. Maurice to a conclusion which each of his rivals expresses with certainly not less clearness, if with some less display of learning. The effect of what happened on the Moselle and the Loire is clearly perceptible in all their essays; and it is impossible to follow out from these the study of the required form of future infantry tactics without being struck by the distinctness with which each of these writers, differing widely as they do in age, experience, and training, pronounces for a modification of our practice which shall give due weight to the experience of the victorious troops of Germany.

Taking Sir Garnet Wolseley first, as a name which all our readers know to be identified with military studies of the most practical nature, we find him going to the point with characteristic vigour and decision. "For infantry attacking infantry," he says, "there can be only one good formation. The tactics which served our purpose in the days of the old musket are utterly unsuited now for war. It is high time, therefore, that some decision should be arrived at, and whatever it may be, that our drill should be altered accordingly. . . . The days when successively deployed stiff lines of infantry could advance as we did at the Alma are past. In lines where the touch is maintained it is impossible to have either the flexibility or the quickness that is now indispensable." And then, passing on to describe the confusion—more apparent, as we believe, than real—which ensued of necessity from the Prussian attacks in loose order, he adds:—"Let us learn from these lessons. Having recognized the necessity for attacking in this fashion, let us set to work at once and endeavour during peace to organize and regulate that confusion; let us practise that disorder until we have reduced it to order, and have established thereon a system following well-understood rules." Having next pointed out that the disorder spoken of among the Germans, so far as it really existed, arose from want of harmony between existing regulations and the tactical requirements of the breechloader—for the changes made before the war (as Captain May in 1869 had warned his comrades) were "not sufficiently radical"—Sir Garnet adds forcibly as to ourselves, that whatever ideas concerning practical fighting our Field Exercises contain are based on Peninsular experience and are inapplicable to modern warfare at present. Finally, he sums up his criticism of existing regulations in the sharp words, "To adhere to them is to court defeat. . . . Let us hasten therefore to lay down rules for fighting that shall be in accordance with war as now practised. Unless we do so, if we encounter European troops, we shall certainly fail"; or, he concludes, if we win, it could only be by suddenly discarding our own practice, and so inducing a confusion which would result in fearful loss. Into his own special recommendations we do not intend to follow Sir G. Wolseley. Nor would it be in accordance with our plan to take out of any of these Essays the particular tactical proposals which are suggested. Our purpose is rather to bring into distinct view the remarkable accordance of the writers in the general view of the necessity of a reform in the matter under discussion.

Passing to Lieutenant Hildyard, whose thoughtful Essay should earn the respect of those who have fancied our line subalterns to be a mere mass of uneducated idlers, we find a careful study of some of the chief infantry attacks that succeeded in the war, from which he deduces the results which no one who cares to inquire can evade, that column formations in actual attack invariably entail enormous loss, and that line movements for the same purpose are scarcely less impracticable. He declares, therefore, absolutely for the third form adopted in the course of the war, defined by him as "an irregular line of small groups, concentrating behind any cover for the shelter it provides, and also before attack for the feeling of security which contiguity gives. Surely there is no doubt," he adds, "which to adopt as a fighting formation"; though the column may still be used for reserves. The line order, too, appears indicated as an alternative, under heavy but distant fire, for his second line of troops in the outline he sketches of a new method of bringing infantry into action.

Lieutenant Waller makes the Duke of Württemberg's pamphlet, with which all the essayists are naturally familiar, the groundwork of his argument on the subject. He differs from the rest in recommending more earnestly than they do an adherence to the familiar line formation—"national" it can hardly be called, as he calls it, by those who know it to have been a simple copy of Frederick's practice. But this recommendation almost disappears when the writer comes to practical details. As, for instance, "Skirmishers will be much more numerous than formerly, and, instead of only part of a battalion skirmishing, with the remainder neatly distributed into supports and reserves (good targets for the enemy's fire), it will probably be found necessary to have whole battalions, and even brigades, extended in skirmishing order." Further on it is well pointed out such swarms of skirmishers, if well trained, are perfectly able to take care of themselves against cavalry. The supporting lines, it is suggested,

are to have two or three paces between their files—a plan which abandons completely the notion of the British line as it was wont to be, to put it into a practical form corresponding to the experience won by the Germans.

None of the essayists are more successful than Captain Russell in hitting off the real secret of the great change which has come about in infantry tactics. That he should thus have got to the very root of the subject is especially creditable to a cavalry officer. It would be unjust to abridge materially the words in which he gives his view:—"The radical difference between the old and new methods of employing skirmishers appears to be this—that whereas formerly skirmishers were taught that they were a feeble formation, and were expected to fall back on their supports soon after the commencement of an action, leaving the ground clear for the action of the force which they had been covering; now their power is allowed—they press on against the enemy's position, and the supports, instead of covering a retreat, push on with them, and extend and strengthen their lines." Apparently, he adds, it is only in this manner that infantry can push forward at all in the face of modern arms. Nor does he omit to advert with proper force—albeit somewhat indirectly—to the concurrent necessity, in making the change advocated, of a thorough previous training of the soldier, which will bring out that individual intelligence on which the new order of battle will certainly throw him. No one of the proposals for a new infantry formation is more carefully reasoned than that with which Captain Russell's criticism on the past is supplemented.

Lieutenant King is, as we last week mentioned, more elaborate than his fellow-essayists in his treatment of the whole subject, and lays down his theories with special precision. He defends the somewhat dogmatic tone in which his proposed system is introduced, by arguing the absolute necessity of such a change from the Duke of Württemberg's authority already referred to. The results which the system would give under actual fire are embodied as follows, and are prefaced by the simple remark that our "slowly advancing line" of British tradition could not certainly succeed where the "small, rapidly moving columns" of the German drill-book failed, as they notoriously did at St. Privat. We ought, therefore, he asserts, to come to somewhat the following order when infantry are actually engaged:—(1) An irregular dense skirmishing line, formed of the original skirmishers and a part of the supports; (2) a second similar line, formed of the rest of the supports; (3) a series of irregular groups, where cover admits of forming local reserves; and further, in rear, the fixed reserve. It is not necessary to point out that the tactical process by which the writer leads up to this result is of as revolutionary a character at the least as any of the other suggestions in this volume.

We have reserved to the last the essay of General Craufurd, because, taken in accordance with the rank and the natural inclination of its author, it affords, if possible, a stronger ground than any of the others for urging the necessity of a speedy and serious change in the infantry drill of our army. For General Craufurd was last employed in command of that Brigade of Guards in which his early youth was passed. If any writer of the present day might be supposed to speak with special authority on the value of the precision and stiffness which those who see but half a soldier's profession presume it to be impossible to combine with agility and acuteness, here he might well be found. Moreover the General is the only one of the seven essayists who expressly states his doubts of the new view that the (front) attack of a position held by troops armed with breechloaders is hopeless. Yet even he, so far from theorizing out of the dead past what troops will do in the living present, falls back unreservedly from the tactics as now practised in the field on the famous "Retrospect" of Captain May, adding for his own comment:—"From whatever motive, it seems to have been found advisable to adopt, under the influence of the breechloader, the extended order of skirmishers as the best formation for the attack."

As these remarks are being written there appears the welcome notice of an experimental drill to be practised at Aldershot on the very principles which the Essayists advocate. The wing of our English battalion is in this to be for us what the Prussians have made their large company. With this one distinction—which need be followed by no real difference—that the forms to be adopted are undisguisedly taken from the experiences of the late war, and from the principles which those who have studied it draw from them. The reform towards which the first step has thus been made is so welcome that few will be disposed to ask whether the natural conservatism of the professional spirit has not delayed it somewhat too long. Had it come earlier, these Essays would have been robbed of much of their interest. As it is, we have shown how unanimous and earnest the writers are upon a question which we take leave to remind our readers is infinitely more vital to the nation whose "infantry is the most formidable in the world" than the improvement of artillery or cavalry tactics. General Craufurd must have felt this truth when he penned the lines with which we are about to conclude. We have reserved them to the last because this condemnation of our former practice, coming from a veteran whose whole bias was in favour of past forms, whose days of professional ambition are over, and whose kindly nature was a proverb wherever he served, carry in their very gentleness a severity and weight which no words of the mere fussy partisan of novelty can possibly approach:—

A complete and searching revision [he says] of our formations and evolutions should be made by a competent Board. . . . After this scrutiny, will our line of deployed battalions approve itself to the judgment as the

formation in which an English force can advance without disorder across two thousand yards of ground covered by the fire of artillery, seconded by breechloading sharpshooters? It behoves us to consider, now that civilians as well as military men are alive to the necessity, how much of our system of drill and manœuvre requires alteration and improvement, with a view to meeting with equal arms and aids the more complete and studied composition of a Continental army. We should take all these steps in the present time of peace, not waiting for the failure which may result from our deficiencies in a battle-field, or in time of pressure, to convince us that we are behindhand in the march of change and improvement which has been so rapid and so visible abroad.

With the General we may well thank the Duke of Wellington for the "happy inspiration" which has produced these Essays, since it has called forth from every part of the service such a consensus of opinion as must force upon the most unwilling the conviction that it is time that our army should cast off the trammels of tradition and be trained for the age to which it belongs.

#### ITALIAN ROME.

NOW that the Italians are established in Rome, it would seem that all parties directly or indirectly concerned find much to regret in the arrangement. It was inevitable perhaps that the old city should become the capital of the new kingdom, or at all events that the experiment should be fairly tried. Old associations were strong, and the rights of the new dynasty must receive a certain sanctity from the fact that it had established its seat on the throne of the Cæsars and the pontiffs. New jealousies were stronger still, and it seemed the best way of keeping the peace between Turin, Florence, and Naples to abandon them all for a city whose superior claims were indisputable. Whether or not the experiment will answer in the end, it is certain that every one is grumbling at present. Pius IX. naturally objects decidedly; indeed his enemies, if he has any, may well compassionate the old man's unhappy fate. He lingers on at the Vatican half on sufferance; his spiritual authority is feeblest in his own immediate neighbourhood, and his temporal power is circumscribed within the limits of the palace garden. In his declining years he keeps his loins girded ready for a pilgrimage *in partibus*, while expressing a sublime confidence in the probability of something turning up to the advantage of the Papacy. If he looks out of his windows, or ventures on a drive through the city where he once was absolute, he is shocked and scandalized at every turn by changes moral and material. Antonelli and his other Ministers find their occupation well nigh gone; and, in spite of themselves, they have to reconsider their ways, and renounce their temporal ambitions. The great ecclesiastical dignitaries can no longer air their scarlet hats and violet stockings, or display their portentous umbrellas on the roof of their venerable coaches with the old apostolic self-complacency. The crowds who used to be reverential or enthusiastic shrug their shoulders with ill-concealed contempt, or indulge in comments the reverse of complimentary; and too many of the citizens set small store by the benedictory wave of the fingers to which they used to bow their heads. As for the dispossessed monks, they wander regretfully round the venerable convents which gave safe and snug shelter to themselves and their predecessors through foreign troubles and domestic discord. The beggars are even worse off than their patrons the monks, for they led even a lazier life, and are for the most part far less fitted to make their way in the world. They can no longer count on the substantial daily dole, or group themselves comfortably round the hospitable gates and the steaming messes served from the convent kitchens. The secret agents of the Papal Government, born of a system that fostered perpetual discontent, have to betake themselves to more open and less lucrative courses; while the brigands can no longer count upon sanctuary and hospitality in the Eternal City, although, to do the Italian Government justice, it allows them the utmost latitude in their professional pursuits, and does much to meet their views in the arrangements of its prisons and courts of justice. On the other hand, all ranks of the Italian immigrants are almost equally dissatisfied. The King is ill at ease in the grim grandeur of the Quirinal Palace, and prefers chasing the *mouflons* on his native hills to bagging snipes and thrushes in the Campagna. The gentlemen who are compelled to follow him and his Government—Ministers, deputies, courtiers, and clerks in public offices—do so with extreme reluctance. In the first place, Rome has become extravagantly dear; in the next, it is unhealthy at all times, and pestilential in the summer. Nor is it only new comers who find things changed for the worse. Those Roman citizens who always detested the Pope and his Government are keenly susceptible to the drawbacks that have accompanied the blessings of the revolution. What they have gained in independence is more than counterbalanced by the increased cost of living; and although they are free now to remove if they please, they do not care to avail themselves of the privilege. The taxation may be no heavier than it used to be—perhaps not so heavy. But the tax-gatherer has become a greater grievance, inasmuch as he addresses himself to them more directly. So altogether the discontent is very general; and although there may be exaggerations, as is always the case when people are grumbling in chorus, yet there can be no doubt that there is much substantial ground for their complaints, and that the new capital has many disadvantages as a place of residence.

Undoubtedly it is both more expensive and more unhealthy than it used to be. With the exception of meat, provisions were never very cheap in Rome, because everything had to



be brought from a considerable distance, and the communications were very bad. There were no highly cultivated farms in the neighbourhood, no rich market-gardens coming up to the gates. The desolation of the Campagna stretches away on the one side to the sea, on the other to the wild and wooded slopes of the Alban hills. To the south the Pontine marshes are interposed between it and the fertile plains of Campania; to the north the roads run for leagues through a barren landscape; and after the worst barrenness is past, the country becomes more picturesque than profitable. There used to be no railways, and it was slow work hauling sacks of grain and crates of vegetables over indifferent roads in primitive waggons lumbering along behind sluggish oxen. There were even fewer facilities of access from the sea than by the land. The port that once received the grain ships of Sicily and Egypt had been choked by sand and Tiber mud. Civita Vecchia was confined and inconvenient, and jealously guarded by heavy Custom duties. So the corn markets in Rome always "ruled firm," vegetables were scarce, and even those served at the better tables somewhat reminded one of weeds gathered by witches on some midnight expedition in a dismal swamp. But in Papal Rome meat used to be supplied in quantity sufficient, although the quality might be indifferent. There was plenty of pasture land in the Campagna, with great droves of oxen, and you saw the flocks of sheep picking up their living everywhere among the beds of dank reeds and among the weed-grown ruins. Their rugged coats and gaunt frames betrayed their condition to the least experienced eye, nor did they bely your first impressions when you met them at table. But if beef and mutton were fibrous and flavourless, at least the butcher's bill was moderate; nor did either restaurateurs or hotel-keepers charge you extravagantly for your dinner. Now things are changed even in that respect. A brisk export trade has been going on, and the Romans have suffered accordingly. The *Times* Correspondent informs us that the price of meat has risen this season to something over threepence per pound, and this must imply short commons for many of the citizens and total abstinence for many more. Fish, of course, was always rare, although fishes teem in the neighbouring Mediterranean. But the coast is so generally unhealthy that one could scarcely expect fishermen to tempt Providence by settling there. That the native wines were poor and the foreign wines extremely costly was comparatively of little consequence to the Romans. Drinking is not a Roman vice, and their experience of their dangerous climate makes them almost timidly abstemious. But they must have houses to inhabit, and that dangerous climate of theirs makes them somewhat fastidious about the quarters they select for their residence. Formerly the choice used to be ample; and if you were not over-particular, you could be accommodated for an absurdly small sum where you might enjoy plenty of air and elbow-room. The city has been always in the way of expanding and shrinking alternately, and latterly it had shrunk. In particular the better class of tenements were almost going a begging; there were palaces, outwardly superb, where you might hire an imposing suite of apartments for the sum which your hotel landlord charged you for a small bedroom and sitting-room. There were others where princely but impoverished owners were willing to let for the season, in consideration of a moderate outlay to whitewash the walls and arrest the progress of decay. Since the Italians came swarming into the place all that is over. The best class of apartments fetch absolutely fancy prices; the lucky proprietors have only to ask and to have. Even Ministers with means are unable to satisfy the necessities of their official position, and have to keep up their diplomatic state as best they may in the upper floors of some hotel. The tumbledown buildings no longer hang on the market; the landlords are reaping a rich harvest and have plenty of money to spend on repairs; in short, while the religious edifices are being somewhat neglected, respectable Rome is renewing its youth so far as its domestic architecture is concerned. But the Italians who are thus crowding into Rome are making the city more unhealthy than ever. We do not say that this greater crowding of the population has that effect directly; at least it is understood that the dirty Ghetto, densely inhabited as it is, suffers less from fevers than the cleaner and more airy, but more deserted, quarters. But many of the new arrivals cannot afford to house themselves at all. The more imposing class of houses is appropriated by their betters, the humbler is already filled to overflowing by Roman residents. So they have taken to squatting on bits of unclaimed land; to running up huts and houses out of the materials supplied in profusion by the old ruins and their debris. In doing so, they have to dig among mouldering foundations and disturb the rotting soil; the noxious vapours which are in fact the malaria disengage themselves, and in consequence the mortality has been steadily on the increase.

Thus it must be admitted that the Italians have some reason for saying that Rome is at present by no means a very desirable residence; nor do matters seem very likely to improve. With an uncultivated neighbourhood, an indifferent access by water, and a rapidly growing population, we can hardly look for a decided reduction in the price of provisions, although the present exorbitant rates may be partly owing to a bad harvest and vintage, and although we should fancy the export of cattle must have stopped if beef is selling for 13d. the pound at home. House-rent can scarcely be lower. Rome must be filled from the Italian provinces so long as it remains the Italian capital; there will always be an incursion of wealthy foreigners in the season, and for them many of the best apartments will be reserved; while

the ultimate success of the experiment of making it the capital is at least sufficiently problematical to induce people to hesitate before investing in building speculations. As for improving the city into a reasonably healthy condition, it seems almost impossible to conceive how it is to be done. A few weeks ago we called attention to the document in which the Committee appointed by the Italian Parliament reluctantly reported against the hope of purifying the Campagna. It may be feared, then, that Rome will remain surrounded by a great extent of unhealthy country to taint the breezes that blow across the city; while within the walls sanitary works, to be successful, must be undertaken on a comprehensive plan at an enormous cost. The very disturbance of the ground would disengage gases and vapours that would necessarily give a great impulse to disease and mortality for the time being, while a heavy additional burden would fall upon the ratepayers, who are loudly grumbling already. But, whatever interest these matters may have for the Italians, we do not imagine they will materially influence the plans of our travelling countrymen who may intend to winter in Rome. Happen what will, the city must always retain its attractions for foreigners; and whether as the bustling seat of the Court and the Government, or the mouldering treasure-house of art and archaeology, there will always be a reasonably prosperous future in store for the Romans who choose to cling to it.

#### FIRE-PROOF BUILDINGS.

IT is unsatisfactory to be told that what are called fire-proof buildings are more dangerous than any others. Yet, speaking broadly, this is the result of the opinions of men of scientific knowledge and practical experience. There is absolutely no such thing as a fire-proof construction. Nothing can resist a good fire well lighted up. The Roman system of vaulted brick chambers affords the best protection against fire, while wrought and cast iron are the worst material that can be used for this purpose. Stone staircases are a delusion, and iron girders are a snare. Next to brick, the best protection is hard wood covered with common plaster. It would be strange if, in building both ships of war and warehouses, there were to be a simultaneous reaction of opinion in favour of the same despised material, wood. But the objection to iron in certain forms in warehouses is much more clear than to any application of it in ships of war. Iron is relied upon by the public as a safeguard against fire, while its use is looked upon by the insurance offices as more dangerous than that of wood. Its first and most obvious defect is that its strength deteriorates rapidly when heated. A careful and competent observer considers that wrought-iron is very sensibly weakened, and cast-iron rendered brittle, at what he calls "comparatively low heats." It is very common, he says, to find iron ties and other similar work bent merely by their own weight in small buildings and other places where the heat has not been great. The failure of wrought-iron girders in a case which he had examined also tended to the same conclusion, for the whole of them were bent, twisted, or broken in the most violent way, although the cast-iron columns on which they rested were only slightly bent. These columns were, however, of much stronger form than is usually found. It is at any rate quite certain that at higher temperatures, such as are to be expected in a large fire, iron rapidly loses strength; and thus a floor or a beam which would bear the weight upon it quite safely at an ordinary temperature might break down at a higher one. Iron is, however, too valuable an aid in building to be laid aside. It is likely to influence, and ought to influence, the designs of builders; and bearing in mind the extraordinary differences produced in its quality by trifling differences in treatment, there may be hope of finding means of removing the defects which now militate seriously against its use. "Meanwhile we must look upon it as being a most dangerous ally."

The same high authority assures us that wood is not quite so dangerous a material as is supposed. In one instance some wooden posts and a girder remained to the end of a fire which melted iron and brass within ten or twelve feet of them. Doubtless there was some current of air which carried the flames away from the wood, but none of the firemen present could say how. A piece of a post from the same building, and close to the same part of it, where the wood was burnt in to some little distance, and scorched deeply in, yet still retained its strength. Several others remained in the same state; and in general large timbers are seldom burnt through in ordinary fires, but have enough of their substance left to act as struts or girders, although of course much weakened. These statements will perhaps shake the common notion, which is that whatever is incombustible, and nothing else, is fire-proof. But of course light woodwork feeds the fire, and solid timbers are, it is to be feared, rare in modern edifices. People believe that if their floors are formed of iron beams on iron pillars, and their stairs of stone, their premises and themselves with them are perfectly safe from fire. A few examples will show how "erroneous and dangerous" this notion is, and how fire treats these "fire-proof" things. The most ordinary and dangerous use of stone is that of stairs. Speaking generally, stone, marble, granite, or any such formations, are utterly untrustworthy in case of fire, unless used of a thickness quite uncommon in modern work. When stone is in thin slabs, and so placed that the fire can play around it, a high temperature is irresistible; but cases are very rare of the failure of a building from the use of stone columns or piers of tolerable size. The fire

scales off the outside in large flakes, but generally leaves a solid core. But it is dangerous to use stone in positions where a large portion of its surface is exposed. The practice is very common of supporting floors on light stone corbels, with a view of saving the walls by preventing the entrance of timber into them; and the risk of whole floors coming down suddenly from this cause is very great. This is no imaginary fear. Cases of whole floors coming down in this way have happened within Captain Shaw's experience, and have placed the lives of himself and his men in imminent peril. Thin slabs of marble and stone are often warped and curled by heat in a curious way like wood. But it is satisfactory to hear that no case is known in which good bricks have been destroyed by fire. The surface has been exfoliated to the depth of an inch or so, and "a long-continued heat of great intensity has vitrified it, but never more." This is what might be expected from its process of manufacture. Bricks, however, are getting very dear, so concrete is likely to be used instead. We know from the examples of old walling how valuable a material this is to resist the effects of time. But for the present purpose we must accept its use with reservation. Ordinary concrete is not to be trusted for fire-proof floors. Flint-work is unsafe, as the flint is calcined so much by fire that walls made of it are shattered to pieces. Ordinary gravel pebbles are equally unsafe. But concrete may be made of broken bricks; and this seems to be approved, though not very heartily. It is a relief to know that ordinary plaster is, "perhaps, the most valuable auxiliary that we have."

Let us consider now the combination of these several materials in different forms of construction. The walls are the most important, but the least difficult in execution, as brick is at once the best and most common material that can be used. It is an almost unexampled case for a fire to destroy a wall of ordinary thickness, as the flames naturally ascend, directing their force on the ceilings through which they usually find vent. Sometimes, however, there is such a stop to the flames from a stubborn ceiling or arch as to allow them no decided vent, and then the walls are exposed to the full action of the fire. Yet even then good brick walls have hardly ever been known to fail. There was a great proof of their strength in the case of the vaults of the Tooley Street warehouses, many of which were filled with oil, converted by the flames into a rolling sea of fire which burnt for weeks. These vaults were built in the usual way of good groined arches supported on brick piers, and not an arch nor a pier broke down under the trial. But every portion of the stories above, many of which were built of iron girders on iron columns, presented such a scene of utter ruin as one could scarcely dream of. No one who had ever seen it would place faith again in iron. We have been quoting from a paper read a few years ago at a meeting of the Royal Institute of British Architects, which was followed by a discussion in which Captain Shaw took part. It is satisfactory to read the testimony which he gave in favour of lath and plaster. Unless plaster breaks or cracks all is likely to be safe inside it. "Numerous instances have occurred in which lath and plaster have been the means of saving large portions of a building from fire, where stone and iron failed when in close contiguity with the fire." Captain Shaw recollected many cases where wooden staircases had stood under heavy fires. He concurred with the author of the paper as to the indestructibility of solid brickwork. It might be affected in numerous ways by intense heat, but fire never passed through the wall. The risk of fire is increased by faulty construction of buildings. In France, says Captain Shaw, it is a rare thing to find a wall tumble down. One reason for this might be that the warehouses are not so enormously loaded as in England, but another and more valid reason appeared to be that this branch of business was more attended to in that country than in this. As regards warehouses in London, Captain Shaw thought that the greatest measure of security was to be found in the proper subdivision of the premises, and the separation and classification of the large store of inflammable materials there deposited. As regards private houses, it would appear that construction as well as materials are too frequently defective. It is, however, satisfactory to learn that it is rare to see a fire communicate from one house to another, as the party walls are usually a perfect bar to the spread of fire, and they have been the means of saving property to a very great extent. It was remarked that gentlemen present connected with fire assurance must be aware that the profits on insurances of private dwellings were enormous. Let us hope that these profits have not diminished since this interesting debate was held. We believe that it contains all that can be usefully said on the subject of fire-proof buildings. The danger from fire in large warehouses has lately become even more manifest, and we are not aware that any new method of protection has been discovered, although it is probable that various pretenders to the discovery of such remedies have appeared in the interval. The late Alderman Humphrey had probably had as much experience as any man in fires in warehouses, and he was of opinion that the joists of a building filled in with concrete, and boards at the top, formed a safer construction in case of fire than iron girders and brick arches, and afforded altogether a better fire-proof building. Certainly this was the opinion of a man who ought to have known what he was talking about, and concrete of good quality is happily not an unattainable commodity.

We sincerely condole with all the believers in stone and iron, whose faith must be rudely shaken by the opinions which we have quoted. It certainly is rather startling to be told that a wooden staircase well plastered underneath is safer than a so-called fire-

proof staircase of stone. Again, it is difficult to believe, except on the highest authority, that iron girders, becoming heated and expanding, have so injured the walls that nearly the whole structure had to be rebuilt, "whereas all would have been saved had the girders been of wood." A common defect in modern houses is that the floors do not fit closely to the walls, so that if water is poured upon the upper part of a building, according to the modern practice of attacking the enemy from above, the floor will not hold the water, and that is a serious cause of loss. There are probably many cases where water does more harm than fire, but we should be sorry to complain that firemen are too active in their duty. The great thing is promptitude, so as to defeat the enemy before he gathers strength. There is, we think, serious and increasing danger from the construction of large warehouses, and it is therefore useful, although disquieting, to be told that there is no such thing as fire-proof. Yet constructive skill, dealing with suitable materials, can doubtless do much to confer on warehouses that security which belongs to a private dwelling built of good brick externally, and well plastered within. Good brick we know is scarce, but there is something in the character of our age which teaches us to expect that it would show itself copious in plaster. The celebrated architect who "found us of brick and left us of plaster" would have earned the gratitude of London if he had not unfortunately put the plaster on the wrong side.

#### BETTING-HOUSES.

THE raid on betting-houses in the City resembles rather closely the efforts which are from time to time made by parochial authorities to move on what is called the social evil. It is not an answer to those who thus put an existing law in force that the unfortunate objects against which it is directed only go somewhere else. If the City authorities can abolish betting-houses within their jurisdiction, let them do so; and it is not their business to inquire whether the evil which is thus repressed in one direction will not break out in another. There are probably very few persons who are so sanguine as to expect that the games of rouge-et-noir and roulette will cease to be played because the establishments at Homburg and Baden-Baden have been closed. It is certain that as long as horse-races are run in England there will be bets on them; and when horse-races cease, there will be bets on something else. The mischief against which the law was originally directed was the keeping of open shops where lists were exhibited, and the public were invited to enter and make bets. But if the law is to be applied to the suppression of every private betting-office, the police are likely to have a busy time. The taste for betting is almost as ineradicable as another propensity to which we have above referred, and in both cases equally the existing demand will be supplied in spite of any regulations which law may make or magistrates enforce. In both cases perhaps it would be well to adopt nearly the same rule of suppressing every infringement of public order and decency, but not searching too curiously into things which do not obtrude themselves on notice. It is notorious that book-making, as it is called, has become an important business, requiring offices and clerks. The advertisements in the sporting journals are much more cautious than they used to be; but still we learn from the last number of *Bell's Life* that Messrs. A. and B., members of various clubs, may be communicated with at a particular address, and that Mr. C. and Mr. D. are prepared to execute commissions to any amount on all "forthcoming events." We also hear that a gentleman receiving very lucrative racing information, for which he pays highly, which we quite believe, is open to communicate the same to another gentleman who would be agreeable to share the cost. The expectation which this gentleman manifestly entertains of making a fortune on the next Derby would be utterly frustrated if magistrates could effectually suppress betting-offices. The dearly purchased information would be valueless unless there existed somewhere facilities for backing the certain winner of a great race. Several writers are now diligently engaged in discussing the performances, health, and prospects of every colt of any character that is engaged in the Derby. The object of all this elaborate criticism is to assist readers in speculating upon the principal "forthcoming event" of 1873. There is spread over England an army of touts who watch horses at exercise, and collect the gossip of stables, and transmit the result as "information," for which gentlemen regularly pay high prices, and on which prophets found their auguries. This extensive branch of industry must decay unless opportunities exist somewhere for backing the horses which have been thus ascertained to be "moral certainties." The advertising gentleman exhibits a form of folly which is irrepressible, and if it could be repressed some other would spring up in its place. After all, it is better to "back" a horse than to take shares in a bubble Company, and there are many establishments in the City much more pernicious to fortune and character than these betting-houses.

It is, however, beyond doubt that the law has been deliberately violated in the City, and unless penalties are inflicted in clear cases, we should soon see betting-houses established in every street. A policeman in plain clothes made repeated visits to an office where he backed a horse at current odds and paid his money. The manager of this office was seated at a desk and near him was a clerk booking bets. There was a large card with the names of the horses entered for a race at Liverpool, and the prices



of the different horses for the day were also upon the card. The witness saw money paid to a man who had won a bet. All this was done in a first-floor room of a tavern, and the Lord Mayor convicted the landlord of "knowingly and wilfully" permitting this room to be used for the purpose of betting with persons resorting thereto. The suggestion that the landlord had let this room, and was not responsible for what was done in it, did not therefore find acceptance. In another case the facts were equally clear, with the addition that the landlord himself presided over the betting business. We learn with some surprise that after the warnings of the last few years this kind of business is thus openly transacted. The defendant's advocate was reduced to the hopeless expedient of asking a mitigation of penalty on the ground that the defendant's mother had been in business as a licensed victualler for forty years. This is exactly like the plea of the Kentish policeman in Miss Braddon's recent novel on behalf of his prisoner who has committed a deliberate murder—that the prisoner's family have owned land in that county for three centuries. A heavy penalty was inflicted on each of these defendants, and the only wonder is that the law has not laid its hand on them before. The Legislature long since determined that betting-offices are an evil to be suppressed, and it is not likely to think them less an evil because they are held at public-houses.

The prosecutions which are still pending against three betting clubs may present greater difficulties. Unless the Home Office is prepared to shut up Tattersall's, it should be cautious in allowing interference with any establishment of the same nature in the City. It is easy to understand that a so-called Club may be merely a betting-office in disguise; and, on the other hand, clerks have as much right as lords to bet among themselves, and to occupy, if they please, rooms convenient for that purpose. The City magistrates may be right in thinking that this is a bad thing for clerks, and we should certainly not contend that it is a good thing for lords. But it is idle to disguise the fact that both clerks and lords are already betting on the Derby. Indeed, an advertiser in *Bell's Life* so strongly feels that the public ought to have facilities in winter for speculating on the "events" of the summer, that he has determined to sacrifice his well-earned repose and to devote the short recess between the racing seasons to making a book on the Derby. That the public should be denied the privilege of laying out their money on the most important and popular race of the year is, he thinks, an anomaly. Inasmuch as no barrier obstructs the way in other directions, he considers that facilities should be accorded for speculating on an event in connexion with which backers generally have predetermined fancies and deliberate selections. Acting on the view thus magniloquently expressed, the advertiser has determined to conduct his operations throughout the winter, and to direct close and special attention to the Derby, which is more than six months distant. From the present moment, therefore, until the day of the race, commissions to any amount will be undertaken, either to win or for places, and attention is invited to a list of prices. The advertiser represents that of late years books upon the Derby have been so few in number and so limited in extent that investment on the "all-eventful contest" has become difficult or impossible. There are, in fact, race meetings almost incessantly for nine months of the year, and for gambling purposes one race is almost as good as another; so that it is likely that the Derby may be, speaking comparatively with former years, neglected during the winter months. But, if this be so, it proves not that the public bet less, but that they bet on a greater variety of "events" than they used to do. It is lamentable to hear a clerk in a public office with a salary of a hundred a year announcing that he expects to net another hundred pounds by backing so-and-so either for the Derby or for some one of the many races to which book-makers and prophets call attention. But the love of betting upon races pervades England and all her colonies and dependencies, and Derby sweeps exist wherever pale ale is drunk. It is evident that such persons as the advertisers whom we have quoted expect to do business, and they can only do it to any extent by the establishment of a sort of betting exchange, or, in other words, a shabby Tattersall's. If, therefore, the City police can extirpate these clubs they will establish themselves elsewhere. The betting fraternity will be compelled to do their business secretly; but it will be done. There is a close parallel between this case and that of the Licensed Victuallers. All the world, except a few fanatics, is convinced that drinking cannot be prevented, and therefore it is thought expedient that the trade in drink should be regulated and placed as far as possible in the hands of respectable men. A similar conclusion will probably be arrived at as regards the class of men who make betting the business of their lives. Those who wish that this trade should be abolished are neither few in number nor fanatical in opinion; but many of them believe their wish to be unattainable. At any rate they do not desire to attain it by persecution, and they strongly object to anything like straining the law for a purpose of supposed utility, and, still more, to applying a different rule to vice according as it exhibits itself in the City Road or at Knightsbridge. A people who have obtained household suffrage are entitled to insist on having provided for them, if they desire it, a Silver Hell. Pedestrians have rights on all thoroughfares, and a fustian jacket may travel the Road to Ruin.

#### THE CRYSTAL PALACE CONCERTS.

THESE well-ordered entertainments increase in artistic importance year by year. They must always be interesting, because their leading object is to bring the finest examples of instrumental music before the public in a style best calculated to win appreciation; and that this object has been in a large measure attained through carefully prepared and highly finished performances, under the direction of Mr. Manns, is proved by the attention with which the orchestral symphonies, concertos, and overtures of accredited composers are listened to, and by the hearty applause that invariably follows movement after movement. The intrinsic value of the Crystal Palace Concerts, however, has been enhanced of late through the frequent introduction not only of works the fame of which occasionally reaches us from abroad, or of works less generally familiar than those by great masters the merits of which have long been recognized, but also of works of home growth, whether by native musicians or resident foreigners. Amateurs are indebted for the opportunities so liberally afforded them of rating at their proper worth the productions of men of such powerful individuality and undoubted genius as Schubert and Schumann; but they are not less indebted in another way for the encouragement which, with resolute persistence, is extended to our own composers. The advantages springing from this recently adopted policy are inestimable; and it must be owned that such English pieces as have from time to time been presented fairly stand their ground. At all events, they have been welcomed, in the majority of instances, with marked favour; and it is this which doubtless emboldens Messrs. Grove and Manns to persevere in the direction referred to—a direction for evident reasons highly to be commended.

Since the opening of the present series of concerts at the Crystal Palace much has been done which might fairly call for special notice; but a passing record in general terms must suffice. To begin with the symphonies, overtures, and concerted pieces which, more than anything else, are the means of giving tone and significance to these performances:—at the first concert we had Beethoven's No. 1 (in C), earliest of a set of genuine masterpieces which alone would have immortalized their author. Although the autograph copy of this symphony is no longer to be found, there is undeniable proof that it was composed in the first year of the present century—the year of *Christus am Oelberge* (known among us as the *Mount of Olives*), when Beethoven was barely thirty. This, keeping in mind the early works of Mozart and Mendelssohn, says little, if anything, for Beethoven's precocity as an inventor; but the Symphony in C shows him already a master of his means. In decision of style and symmetry of form it has not been surpassed, even by the far greater works that were the result of his seemingly inexhaustible genius. Like the colossal Symphony No. 9, the Symphony No. 1 must always be heard with interest, as in some sense the Alpha, to which the No. 9 was the Omega, of his artistic productivity. What Beethoven did in the interval of two and twenty years which separated them is unexampled. The overtures at this first concert were Spontini's to *Olympie*, and the "Festival Overture," composed for the recent Norwich Festival by Mr. F. H. Cowen. Spontini, a prominent man in his way, was also somewhat of a blusterer. Nevertheless, there is a great deal in his music worth preserving; and we should like to see his name more frequently in our concert programmes. That Spontini's dramatic works are irretrievably buried is true, although he was the veritable founder of the Meyerbeer school, and indeed of that school which, in Paris especially, is known as "grand opera"; but they contain not a few things, we repeat, which might now and then be revived. The "Festival Overture" of Mr. Cowen has unquestionable merit; but it fails to show the progress of which his admirable symphony in C minor gave such justifiable hopes. At the same concert Madame Mangold Diehl played, with great ability, the *Romance* and *Rondo Finale* from Chopin's pianoforte concerto in E minor. In this feeble, but occasionally pretty and hyper-sentimental work, the pianoforte has the lion's share, the orchestral accompaniment being meagre and uninteresting—so much so that we hardly regretted Madame Diehl's omission of the first and most ambitious movement.

At the second concert the symphony was Spohr's picturesque and gorgeous "No. 4" (in F), which, played as it is ordinarily played, under Mr. Manns' direction, at the Crystal Palace, may be called the "Power of Sound," the "Consecration of Sound," or anything else—it little matters. Enough that it is Spohr's finest production of the kind—finer than his No. 2 (D minor), which, when first made known in London, half a century ago, drove all the young and earnest English musicians wild, and created the "Spohr fever," of long endurance; finer even than the No. 7 (in C), *Irisches und Geistliches im Menschenleben*—the symphony for two orchestras, big and small—not quite unworthy, by the way, of the attention of Mr. Manns. The overtures were the *Zauberflöte* of Mozart, and Herr Wagner's *Rienzi*, compositions luckily as wide apart as the poles. At the third concert the second of Beethoven's symphonies was given, in accordance with a pledge to produce the "Nine" in chronological order. About the Symphony in D we need not speak in detail, so universally is it known and admired. Written when Beethoven was thirty-two, it may justly be styled his first "representative" orchestral work, inasmuch as it affords the earliest proof of his determination to overlook what had gone before in the way of symphonic writing, and to create a new world for himself. The Symphony in D is now some 70 years old (it was completed in 1802), and

yet it is difficult to imagine anything fresher or more independent. Like the fourth symphony (B flat) it must have been produced when the spirits of its composer were lightest and healthiest—the slow movements of each, melodious and tender as they are, offering few, if any, indications of the gloom so frequently his marked characteristic. Nevertheless, in paying homage to the extraordinary genius of Beethoven, we must not be unjust to his predecessors; and we find it by no means easy to agree with “G,” the ingenious annotator of the Crystal Palace Programmes, who gravely asserts that neither Haydn nor Mozart ever wrote “anything so large in style, so fresh and forcible in ideas, so various in instrumentation, so vivid in colour, and leaving so great a total impression on the hearer,” as this same Symphony in D. Some half-dozen of Haydn’s symphonies might be pitted against it; while the Symphonies in E flat, G minor and C (the so-called “Jupiter”) of Mozart are not merely its equals, but, in the last two instances especially, its superiors. We cannot imagine a comparison to the detriment of Mozart with any of the slow movements in his three greatest symphonies and the *larghetto* of Beethoven’s “No. 2.” Critics, while asserting, and with justice, the striking originality of Beethoven, are apt to forget that Haydn and Mozart were quite as original in their time, and that Beethoven in his early career, taking those masters for guides, owed them not a little. The overtures at the third concert were Cherubini’s *Ali Baba*, his latest dramatic work, written for the Grand Opera in Paris some forty years ago, and performed there with questionable success—although, notwithstanding the drawback of a weak libretto, it is full of beauties; and the fiery *Ruy Blas*, in which Mendelssohn treads so closely upon the steps of Weber, and bravely emulates *Coriolan* and *Egmont*, the so-called and unequalled “Character-Overtures” of Beethoven. Not the least interesting feature in this programme was a concerto in E minor, for organ, with orchestral accompaniments, the composition of Mr. Ebenezer Prout, one of our ablest musicians, who has boldly struck out a new path in which others will doubtless endeavour to follow him. The execution of the organ part could not have been entrusted to one more competent than Dr. Stainer—Sir John Goss’s successor at St. Paul’s Cathedral, and one of the most skilful organists of the day. Mr. Prout may be congratulated on the conception and carrying out of an original work which is tolerably sure to make its mark.

The fourth concert began with the overture to the *Wedding of Camacho*, one of the prodigies of Mendelssohn’s early youth, and one which the Crystal Palace appears to have the exclusive privilege of bringing before the public, although the entire opera has been printed in pianoforte score. The programme included a selection from Mr. Arthur Sullivan’s music to the *Tempest* of Shakespeare, which has always charmed, and charms now as much as ever. It comprised also the *May Queen* of Sir Sterndale Bennett. About compositions so generally known and accepted it is unnecessary to speak; but that the *May Queen* will last as long as English music lasts, we conscientiously believe.

The programme of the following concert was of sufficient interest to draw together the largest audience of the season, the music-hall being crowded in every part. No one could have been otherwise than pleased to see in the selection an overture by Mr. Wingham, one of the most promising pupils in the Royal Academy of Music. Many, however, who remembered with satisfaction the high pretensions and solid merit of Mr. Wingham’s symphony in B flat (given last year), and augured so much from it, were more or less disappointed by this new effort. We have never had implicit faith in what the French call “*pièces d’occasion*”—not forgetting the overture to Handel’s *Occasional Oratorio*, and the *Weiche des Hauses* of Beethoven. The “occasion” rarely inspires the musician; and Mr. Wingham’s overture, intended to celebrate the Fiftieth Anniversary of the foundation of the Royal Academy of Music, is no exception to the rule. The leading themes are not striking, nor are they original. Beethoven, in the *scherzo* of his *Pastoral Symphony*, wrote a theme which is in two keys, the first half in one, the second in another. But in such erratic examples Beethoven is a dangerous model. Like a will-o-the-wisp, he is apt to lead the young and enthusiastic astray. Mr. Wingham attempts something of the kind in the second theme of his *allegro*; his mode of procedure, however, differing from that of Beethoven, and wherein it differs the advantage lying incontestably with the German musician. That the “*Festal Overture*” is clever and full of vigour, we admit; and also consent with “G” as to its truly “*festal character*.” Nevertheless, it is a long way behind the symphony in B flat, from the author of which we had a right to expect better things. At the same time, we repeat what we have already urged on behalf of our young Academician—viz. that he diligently and successfully avoids the Mendelssohn and Spohr grooves, which have been the quasi-ruin of so many aspiring composers, abroad and at home. Mr. Wingham thinks for himself, and disdains to resort to borrowed materials. What he has to say, not the manner of saying it, makes the composer; and the more emphatically he says it after a fashion of his own, the better. Mr. Wingham’s overture, despite certain crudities in the orchestral score, was well played and well received; but he must try his hand again, avoiding, as much as possible, “*pièces d’occasion*.” Another hearing may possibly in some degree modify our opinion of his new work; but such was the impression conveyed by a single performance. The concerto on this occasion—Mozart’s in B flat, the last composition of the kind in which the pianoforte, or “clavier” plays a leading part—is, with the exception of the concertos in D minor and C minor, the finest of all the twenty-five. It was written in

January, 1791, eleven months before the illustrious musician’s death, and is not merely his “farewell” concerto, but the last of the twelve intended expressly for performances at which he himself was to be pianist. A more finished and thoroughly wrought out masterpiece does not exist. Its beauty lies not merely in the spontaneous and exquisitely graceful themes and counter-themes of each particular movement, but in the wonderful skill with which they are developed, all the instruments—violins, violas, basses, flute, oboes, bassoon, and horns (such is the orchestral complement) having something more or less important to say—reminding us of Robert Schumann’s remark about the *scherzo* of Mendelssohn’s A minor symphony, that “the instruments seem to be talking to each other.” So it is in this concerto of Mozart, who as a creator of “abstract music” in its highest perfection has been surpassed by none—“not” Beethoven “nor another,” as the Laureate might have sung, had his theme been music instead of chivalry. Mozart is the “blameless king” of music, whether Beethoven be the Lancelot or the Tristram. But, to descend from Parnassus, among all musicians Mozart was the purest and most musical, as this last concerto, which we do not think has been played in public for half-a-century, would alone suffice to show. No man spoke the language of melody so fluently, and at the same time with such persuasive eloquence as he. Madame Arabella Goddard (our most indefatigable searcher after forgotten treasures) honourably acquitted herself of an honourable task, in her execution of the pianoforte part in this concerto, the only way to do justice to which is to present with scrupulous accuracy what the master has set down, and by sympathetic and never over-drawn expression to allow him to speak for himself, and so be easiest understood. This Madame Goddard did, and thereby earned enthusiastic and well merited applause. The cadenzas introduced in the first and last movements of the concerto were written (as we learn from the programme) expressly for her by Herr Reinecke, successor of Mendelssohn’s intimate friend, Herr Julius Rietz, as conductor of the Leipsic Gewandhaus Concerts, which Mendelssohn himself conducted so many years, for his own glory and that of the justly famous institution. The concluding overture at this concert was the *Leonora* of Beethoven, in C, generally accepted as the second of four written for *Fidelio*. Of this we have spoken more than once. It is not equal to No. 3, but it is superior to Nos. 1 and 4, and by any composer less fastidious than Beethoven would have been considered of importance enough to be the orchestral prelude even to such an opera as *Fidelio*. The symphony was Mendelssohn’s in A minor (the “Scotch”)—a more uniformly splendid rendering of which it is impossible to conceive. The vocal music at these performances does not generally call for special notice; but on the occasion under notice one of the singers, Miss Fanny Heywood, introduced the first of the three “Spring-Songs” composed by Mozart in the same year as the pianoforte concerto played by Madame Goddard, the theme of which, although in another key, is nearly identical with that of the *finale* to the instrumental work. The other singer, Mr. Vernon Rigby, selected a very fine air from *Idomeno*. Why do we hear so little of this, Mozart’s own favourite opera?—No lyric drama is more crowded with genuine beauties.

An almost irreproachable performance of Beethoven’s *Sinfonia Eroica* (No. 3)—that magnificent inspiration through which he first declared his entire independence of all preceding models, and which in certain respects is his orchestral masterpiece, was the chief feature of the sixth concert. The overture to *Der Freischütz*, perhaps Weber’s strongest, and the overture to Schiller’s *Bride of Messina*, perhaps Schumann’s weakest, were also given, together with a *rondo* in B flat by Beethoven, for pianoforte with orchestral accompaniments, originally intended (according to the excellent authority of Nottebohm) for the concerto in the same key, but ultimately rejected. Had this *Rondo* been one of the “posthumous” works of Mendelssohn, there would have been an outcry from certain quarters; but proceeding from Beethoven, there was of course nothing of which complaint could decently be made. Nevertheless Mendelssohn was a great master, too; and the *Rondo* of Beethoven is puerile at the best. Mr. Ridley Prentice played the pianoforte part carefully and well; but the “posthumous” work created no sensation. At the concert on Saturday last—besides the most characteristic of Cherubini’s overtures, that to the opera of *Les Abencerrages*, as forcible as its far off successor, *Ali Baba*, is feeble, Sir Sterndale Bennett’s fanciful and exquisitely modelled concert-overture, *Paradise and the Peri*, composed in 1862, for the Jubilee of the Philharmonic Society, and Haydn’s Symphony in G, designated by musical archeologists as “Letter V,” containing a slow movement and a *rondo finale* which Haydn himself has rarely surpassed, and few composers since Haydn have equalled—the audience were favoured with Herr Anton Rubinstein’s pianoforte concerto in D minor. Such a piece as the last-named—a mere farrago of vapid bombast, as empty as it is pretentious, and as mechanically exacting as it is musically worthless—is surely out of place at concerts which have chiefly, if not wholly, in view the encouragement and progress of legitimate art. Mr. Fritz Hartwigson, after his fashion, a wonderful manipulator of the keyboard, took commendable pains to make the most of his very ungrateful task, and though frequently he could scarcely be heard at all, when he was heard he achieved enough to make sober people regret that so much talent and labour should have been expended on so thankless a task. After such a display Kotzawa’s *Battle of Prague*, Nicolai’s Sonata in C, or even Pleyel’s *Concertante* would have been a relief.

We are glad to find that Mr. Danreuther, a pianist of the



highest attainments, who has hitherto, at the Crystal Palace, chiefly played works like Liszt's Concerto in E flat, &c., very little better than the D minor concerto of Herr Rubinstein, is set down in the programme of to-day for the fifth, last, and greatest concerto of Beethoven—the concerto of concertos—in which his admirable execution will no doubt be shown to signal advantage. In conclusion we may state that another unknown symphony by Schubert—one of two in the key of B flat—is in the possession of the Crystal Palace Directors, and will speedily be introduced. For this we are again indebted to the zealous and indefatigable research of Mr. George Grove, who has done more to let the musical world know what it owes to Schubert than any other man in Europe.

## REVIEWS.

### PALGRAVE'S ESSAYS ON EASTERN QUESTIONS.\*

THIS volume is a reprint of ten essays which the author has contributed to various well-known periodicals mainly during the last three years. Five of the papers relate more or less to the present state of social, religious, and political feeling amongst the Mahometans in the Levant and on the North-Eastern frontier of Turkey. The sixth gives a graphic account of the five great sects of the Christian Church in the tract which is bounded by Persia on one side, Russia on another, and the Mediterranean on a third. The seventh is taken up with a visit to a monastery, and the eighth with the details of an insurrection against the Russians. The ninth and tenth are filled with the adventures of a poet and of a robber, the latter of whom lived just before the rise of Mahomet, while the other was an ornament of the Court of Damascus in the time of its meridian splendour. Those who have studied the work on Central and Eastern Arabia published by Mr. Palgrave some few years since will scarcely need to be told that these essays are full of anecdote and interest; that they evince an intimate familiarity on the part of their author with Arabic literature and with the details of Oriental life; and that they are animated by a strong admiration for the better parts of the Mahometan character and by an unabated confidence in the permanence and vitality of the faith of Islam. The experiences of many a long journey on horseback, and many a day and night passed in the hovels of Syria, are condensed into these narratives. Nothing seems to come amiss to Mr. Palgrave. Armenian cookery, greasy pilloas, coverlets thick with dirt; poetical inscriptions in Persian, in Arabic, and in the high-flown jargon of Stamboul; political speculations about "Emperor, Ottoman, which shall win," and sectarian differences between Maronites and Melchites—*omnia novit*. And we are bound to say that, though these pages teem with Orientalisms like an Indian blue-book, Mr. Palgrave is never dull or tedious. The reader will be led on by a picturesque diction and a lively style to take interest in heads of dynasties, robber chieftains, and amatory poets on whom he has previously bestowed no more thought or care than he had on Henry Pimpernel and old John Naps of Greece.

Intense enjoyment of the incidents of Eastern travel and thorough knowledge of the language, literature, and habits of the people fairly justify Mr. Palgrave in his assumption of superiority over the ordinary lecturers and writers on the great Eastern question. He has a curt remark page for the Resident, diplomatic, consular, or commercial; for the Levantine, who is half Greek or Armenian, one-quarter English, and the remainder French; and for the genuine British tourist—each and all of whom occasionally feel themselves called on to enlighten the public with the results of a ten years' sojourn or a six months' tour in Anatolia or Syria. The educated gentleman who has "done" Egypt and Syria is one of these three persons whom we may have occasionally met. A fair knowledge of *Edith* and the *Crescent and the Cross*; a few sentences of Arabic picked up from a vocabulary published by Moulavi Mohammed Bakur of the Madrasah of Al-Kitab; acquaintance with Italian sufficient to catch two-thirds of what is communicated by a Dragoman who speaks indifferently the language of Dante in guttural accents, and three others besides; the inevitable burnous, fez cap, and nargillah purchased in the bazaars of Cairo or Damascus at about twice their proper value; two or three months spent in a *Khandjia* on the Nile or a tent in the Desert; a glimpse at the household of some *Beg* or *Kathkuda*; and a goodly amount of wild pigeons, quail, and snipe laid low with a breechloader—these are the qualifications or experiences which have warranted a tourist in delivering well-rounded opinions on the political prospects of the Turkish Empire, and which remind us of Thackeray's Harry Foker, when he toured in the East to console himself for rejection by Blanche Amoy, or of a character whom Mr. Disraeli describes in one of his earlier novels as sitting cross-legged on an ottoman after his return to England, and cutting up his venison with a yataghan. For some books of travel it is quite obvious that intimate familiarity with the customs of agriculturists and the language of heads of villages is not essential. Picturesque scenery, graceful architecture, sculptures defaced or half-buried in sand, crowds of buyers and sellers at a great fair, or of dusty pilgrims at some celebrated shrine, can be attractively and correctly described by any educated traveller who has an eye for colour and a pen for

effect. Indeed, it may be admitted that a person possessed of these qualifications may, in a rapid tour through a foreign country, add materially to our information regarding it and its inhabitants, though he never dreams of disputing with Kazis or Sheikhs in their own dialect, and can scarcely command Arabic or Persian sufficient to call for his camel or his boat. But the case is very different where a writer would explore the inner life and gauge the latent capacities of a semi-civilized or decaying nation. Mr. Palgrave pertinently asks us to consider what title a Japanese or a Spaniard would have to be listened to on the question of the Irish Church, or on that of Landlord and Tenant. Many an Englishman, we fear, would pass a very indifferent examination if compelled to give the authorities for his confident prophecies as to the future destiny of Arab and Turk. On the other hand, we do not forget that excessive sympathy may beget undue admiration, and those who escape the idols of the market may be found blindly worshipping before the idols of the cave.

Though, at first sight, there may appear to be some want of coherence and logical sequence in these essays, one or two pervading ideas will be found to run through them all. They all, in some fashion, illustrate Mr. Palgrave's theory of the vitality, permanence, or excellence of the Mahometan faith. According to our author the sick man is recovering; the creed is instinct with life; and the social system is by no means incapable of progress. Religion, we are told, can make anything of an Arab. It metamorphoses a clumsy rustic into a capital soldier. It supplies Pasha and peasant with one and the same object of adoration, which never wearies and never fails. It furnishes him with a simple creed, not, as some have supposed, harsh and inflexible, but free from superstition in its adjuncts, and unexacting in practice; it tinges his poetry and it makes his law. In short, according to Mr. Palgrave, by its fundamental doctrine of the unity of God, it enables the Mahometan to stand on a broad platform of fixed principles, to proscribe changes as superfluous or impracticable, and to look down with a compassionate smile on the rivalries and contentions of other less fortunate sects. Mr. Palgrave is not, however, blind to the weak points in the Mahometan system, though he appears to us somewhat to underestimate their importance, and to augur for the Crescent a wider range and a greater brilliancy than we should have thought possible. Owing to bad ordinances and profligate administration the "agricultural interests" have been ruined. Tenant rights, perfectly compatible with the feudal privileges of superior holders, have been exchanged for a proprietorship which carries with it additional burdens and responsibilities, and the consequences are visible in broken bridges, deserted villages, and untilled fields. Then, as many of our readers know already, the Mahometan lawgiver set his face sternly, not only against usury and interest, but against insurances, investments, and the whole fabric of commercial credit and legitimate speculation. The consequence of this narrowness is that all enterprise in this direction has been monopolized by the Greeks and Armenians. Mussulmans have been distanced by these two classes, just as in India they have been outstripped by the supple and astute Hindoo, with whom trading is an instinct and money-lending a cardinal virtue. But, though you expel nature with a pitchfork, she persists in returning; and the Mussulman has been driven to pitiable shifts and evasions to compass the most ordinary and imperative transactions of social existence. Some amusing instances are given in the second of the essays. A conditional sale of a thing not yet in existence is forbidden, and yet Ahmed wishes, in the month of February, to dispose to Mohammed of the produce of a vineyard which will not be ripe till autumn. How is this bargain, advantageous to both parties, to be concluded, without violating the distinct letter of the law? A cat is introduced with a couple of branches of the vine suspended across her back; these are supposed to represent acres covered with luscious fruit; and in the presence of witnesses are then and there solemnly disposed of for twenty thousand piastres. The same childish subterfuges are resorted to for the transfer of other commodities, stones or bricks, olives or soap. It is impossible that a people which thus keeps the letter and breaks the spirit of the law can escape demoralization. We are quite willing to credit several of the classes with the good qualities ascribed to them; to believe in their generosity and hospitality, their ease of manner, independence of bearing, strong family feelings, and unquestioned good faith. We are also fully prepared to admit that the population of what is designated by the author as the North-east Turkish frontier is more likely to hold together than to crumble to pieces; to assume new forms than to dissolve into nothingness. But, for all that, a Mahometan preacher of reform and purity has serious difficulties to contend with in the hard, narrow, and rigid formulas which, by the very essence of his mission, he is bound to enunciate. And when the author, after a lively description of the monastery of Sumelas, high up in the hills south-east of Trebizond, inveighs against the monks as ignorant, superstitious, bigoted, and useless, and as inheriting a system "retrograde and odious," did it not occur to him that some at least of these ugly adjectives might be applied with equal reason to any Mahometan power which, in order to hold its own, must set itself to compete with Greek cunning, to secure British assistance, and to defy Russian aggression?

The contrast between the union of Islam and the divisions of Christianity was much too tempting to be passed over in silence, and we are accordingly treated to a very clever and not uninteresting picture of the five sects or Churches which exist in the region

\* *Essays on Eastern Questions*. By William Gifford Palgrave, Author of "Central and Eastern Arabia." London: Macmillan & Co. 1872.

mentioned at the beginning of this article. They are all specimens of Dr. Johnson's good haters. Their distinguishing qualities, good or bad, are set down somewhat as follows. The Greek sect is characterized by decent and even spacious dwellings, slatternly attendants, uncomfortable furniture, childish conversation destitute of any tinge of literature, commerce, and science, and keen love of pelf. The Greek gossips in church and at prayers, on which occasions his demeanour is in remarkable contrast to that of a well-conducted Mahometan, who will kneel down at sunset on a "maidan," or by the side of a public road, and bow his head in the direction of Mecca with admirable gravity. The Greek drinks coffee, sips rakes, invents telegrams, cultivates badly, and makes money by sea and land. On the other hand he spends large sums on education, and decorates churches. In some points his character seems to us not very unlike that of the educated Bengali, with its mixture of shabbiness and generosity, and its fondness for show and for litigation. The Armenian, who comes next in order, is shrewd, muscular, good at agriculture, excellent in his cookery, and unsurpassed in usury. Mr. Palgrave is compelled to own that European sympathy would be least thrown away on this sect. The clergy are respectable, and there is a solidity about them, their manners and domestic arrangements, which makes their numbers of weight in the State. The Maronites are numerically inferior to Greeks and Armenians; but Mr. Palgrave, after making deductions from their claims to antiquity, admits their tenacity and endurance, and explains how they got the upper hand of the Druses. The Maronites are divided into three classes, of which the clergy are rich and luxurious, the townsfolk dull, clumsy, and unenterprising, and the countrymen persevering and industrious. To the fourth class, of Greek Catholics or Melchites, our author ascribes genuine Arabian descent; and it is not very unfair to credit this fact with some of the commendation for which these Christians are singled out. They have the courage of soldiers and the heroism of martyrs; they speak pure Arabic; they have evinced great capacity for administration; they are proud and independent; and they "outshine every competitor" in poetry and eloquence. It is proper, however, to state that the divided counsels which have ruined their prospects are a Mahometan and not a Christian legacy. The last sect is numerically the most insignificant, with exception of the Melchites, but is remarkable for a pure descent, a strong nationality, and a history more ancient than the Pyramids. It is the sect of the Copts. Of all their great national qualities nothing seems to have remained with them but aptitudes for arithmetic and architecture. Yet, in spite of servitude and degradation, they occasionally evince shrewdness and capacity; they can build with elegance as well as with solidity; and they understand irrigation and horticulture. One dark stain on their character we hope may soon be effaced. They are still the chief agents in the disgraceful traffic of eunuchs for the harems of the East.

We have no space for a detail of the Abkhasian insurrection, and probably not one reader in a thousand will have any conception of the locality of Soukhoun-Kalé or So'ouk Soo. Neither can we do more than draw attention to the two episodes of the poet Omar and the brigand Ta'abbet-Shurran. But they are full of incident and animation, and, with many characteristics peculiarly Oriental, they have an affinity with the adventures of similar worthies much nearer to us. On one occasion the poet is led blindfolded into the tent of a lady of rank, "of the loveliest face, the sweetest disposition, and the perfectest breeding," and she turns out to be the daughter of the reigning Caliph. This smacks of the *Arabian Nights*. On another he seats himself on a hillock six miles out of Mecca, and remains drinking with a boon companion, to the great scandal of devout and orthodox pilgrims, after a fashion which reminds one of the carouse of Friar Tuck and King Richard "for a matter of three short hours," as the Clerk of Copmanhurst puts it. The adventures of the brigand are as exciting as some of the great novelist's Highland stories, and there is a picture of his escape, when caught by mortal foes in a cave halfway down a precipice, which is not very dissimilar to the escape of Henry Morton when Burley destroys the title-deeds of Tillietudlem, and bids his ancient comrade in arms to "fight, yield, or die!" But for all this, and for some forcible translations from Arabic poetry, and for a terrible retribution inflicted on another robber named Shan-fara, who dies, hopeless and defiant, in the genuine Byronic vein, we must refer our readers to the book itself.

We have one or two further criticisms to offer. The Scotch proverb is not "It is a far cry to Lochaber," but "It is a far cry to Lochow," the saying being proverbial to the tribe of Campbell, and meaning that their hereditary domains were beyond the reach of an invader. Lochaber, we beg leave to say, was specially famous for axes of a particular shape. Then Mr. Palgrave spells the head of the Mahometan faith in no less than three different ways—Chaliph, Khalif, and Caliph. The correct spelling is Khalif or Khalifa; and we should be glad if Mr. Palgrave could tell us why this high and holy word is constantly in India given by natives as a familiar appellation or nickname to the domestic tailor and the village farrier. An accomplished Orientalist, now deceased, used to say that the fashion must have originated with the Moghul Emperors, and the jests of the mixed multitude of soldiers, sutlers, and followers who, out of great camps, created the cities of Agra and Delhi, and out of the Hindi and the Persian languages, produced the modern Hindustani or Urdu. Objection may also be taken to disparaging comments and snappish remarks to which Mr. Palgrave gives vent in regard to Christianity. We do not by this call in question his facts regarding

Eastern sects. But such expressions as "Western polytheism," and "David and the census and plague," are likely to give offence to many persons, and they are not used with any intelligible practical object. They are merely shafts let fly as caprices or pique dictates.

But, with all its errors, the book is decidedly a valuable addition to the stock of literature on which men must base their opinion of the difficult social and political problems suggested by the designs of Russia, the capacity of Mahometans for sovereignty, and the good government and retention of India. We quite agree with Mr. Palgrave that these points are closely connected. A blow struck on the Euphrates would be felt on the Indus or Jhelum. And, as we are by the force of circumstances a great Asiatic Power, it is of the utmost importance to know what any Asiatics think of us. On this subject Mr. Palgrave throws much light. It may be that other writers will attain to as complete a mastery over the Arabic language and literature, and may defy detection when officiating as Imams. It may be, too, that other travellers in the East will compensate for their want of this priestly erudition by as lively a style and as practised a penmanship. But it will not be easy to find one who combines both qualities to the same extent, who discusses politics and religion like a Moolla, and who yet can write like a finished English scholar.

#### FORSTER'S LIFE OF DICKENS.\*

THE second volume of Mr. Forster's Life of Dickens, though it contains much that is worth reading, has hardly the interest of the first. It contains no revelation so curious and unexpected as that of the early life of Dickens, and certain faults which we could then overlook have now become so prominent that it is necessary to notice them plainly. The book is about three times its proper length; but that may be pardoned on the ground that, whilst the interest in Dickens is still fresh, many trifles may be admitted which a later biographer would more properly excise. The most conspicuous blemish of Mr. Forster's writing is one for which he has provided us with an obvious parallel. When Leech was illustrating one of Dickens's Christmas books he inadvertently admitted into one of the principal scenes a character who, according to the story, had no right to be there. In Mr. Forster's picture of Dickens's life, we become rather vexed by the extreme prominence of what ought surely to be at most a subsidiary figure. When we have read through the volume, we are rather amazed to look back and remark that the frontispiece contains only a portrait of Dickens. To make the illustration harmonize with the book, Dickens should have been drawn looking up with affectionate reverence to another person, and that person should have been Mr. Forster himself. The title too is something of a misnomer. The book should not be called the Life of Dickens, but the History of Dickens's Relations to Mr. Forster. We have no doubt whatever—indeed, almost every page contains conclusive proofs—that Dickens entertained a very high regard for Mr. Forster, but Mr. Forster might have been content with establishing that fact, say, fifty times. The fifty-first demonstration becomes a little tedious, and one is inclined to say to the author, before the end of the four hundred and sixty-second page, "My dear sir, you have been very polite in pointing out all the beauties of the object you are describing, and now, if you would be so very kind as just to stand out of the light for a little, we shall be able to see it all the better for ourselves."

Dickens's affection for and confidence in Mr. Forster must indeed have been remarkable. He seems to have regarded him as Pope regarded Bolingbroke, as his "guide, philosopher, and friend." For once we have the ordinary biographical conditions reversed. It is the Johnson giving us the life of his Boswell. Dickens never takes a step in life, from the most trivial to the most important, without consulting his oracle; and whenever some rare accident leads him to neglect the oracle's advice he generally has cause to repent. Is Dickens in doubt whether he should receive money for lecturing on behalf of a charitable institution? He writes to Mr. Forster. "My opinion" is for returning the money; and the money is returned accordingly. Should Dickens write letters to the *Chronicle*? Mr. Forster is particularly requested to "turn the matter over in his mind at leisure"; and his decision is accepted. Should Dickens put off a dinner when he has accidentally invited more guests than his lodging will contain? "Advise, advise, advise!" he writes to Mr. Forster, and after an elaborate detail of his difficulties he ends once more, "Advise, advise!" On this occasion, strange to say, Mr. Forster's advice to throw over the party is rejected, and yet "the dinner went off very pleasantly." Should Dickens publish a weekly paper—a kind of foretaste of *Household Words*—to be called the *Cricketer*? He states his own view, and then exclaims, "But you shall determine. What do you think? And what do you say? . . . Which is it, my dear fellow?" Should Dickens take part in the *Daily News*, then to be started? Mr. Forster anxiously considers the point, and sees the real objection to the proposal—namely, the state of Dickens's health—though, unfortunately, he does not impress the view with sufficient clearness upon his friend. Has Dickens hit upon a good plan for a Christmas story? He does not advance in it at once, "being curious first to see whether its capacity seemed to strike me at all." The book presently is in type. Dickens has two

\* *The Life of Charles Dickens*. By John Forster. London: Chapman & Hall. 1873.



anxieties about it—to know that the slips have reached Mr. Forster, and to know how they strike him. "What do you think," he asks, "of the concluding paragraph? Would you leave it for happiness sake?" What are the illustrations to be? "Do you think it worth while to throw the period back at all for the sake of anything good in the costumes?" Should the story appear at once, or be delayed for a year? "Your kind help is invoked. What do you think? Would there be any distinctly bad effect in holding over this story for another twelvemonth?" Mr. Forster is for delay; and the delay is determined upon. Is Mr. Dick's delusion in *David Copperfield* not to Mr. Forster's liking? Another shall be substituted. Should the often-discussed periodical appear in a certain form? Mr. Forster's doubts are not at first admitted, but Dickens acquiesces ultimately in their justice. What form shall *David Copperfield* assume? Mr. Forster has suggested that it shall be written in the first person, and Mr. Forster's suggestion is at once gravely taken up, and carried out accordingly. What do you think? Advise, advise, advise—that seems to be Dickens's one cry to Mr. Forster through many years, and we doubt not that the advice was generally sound. But should it have been brought forwards quite so prominently? The author of an autobiography generally apologizes for a too frequent use of the pronoun "I"; but it is not often that a biographer pure and simple has occasion to make the same excuse—not that Mr. Forster seems to be conscious that any excuse is wanted.

The fault is unluckily characteristic of the book in a wider sense. Besides a certain pomposity of tone which affects us unpleasantly, Mr. Forster has been led to take a singularly narrow view of the duties of a biographer. His method of composing the book has been charmingly simple. He has merely stitched together all the letters which he received from Dickens, and connected them by explanatory matter. The view thus afforded of Dickens's character is necessarily onesided. Dr. Holmes says somewhere that there are really four people in every dialogue between A. and B. There is A. as he appears to himself, or A.'s A.; and there are also A.'s B., and B.'s A., and B.'s B. In this book we have not Dickens's Dickens, nor anybody else's Dickens except Mr. Forster's Dickens. In a certain sense this must of course be true of every biography; but the ordinary biographer condescends to give us by all the means in his power views of his hero as they appear to other people. He is not content with a simple photograph, but aims at stereographic effects. The easiest method of accomplishing this object is to give us selections from correspondence addressed to more than one person. Every good writer, and especially a man of such versatility and ready sympathy as Dickens, shows different sides of himself when writing to different people. It may almost be said to be a test of really good letter-writing that you should know by the tone of the letter to whom it is addressed. Cowper's exquisite letters would only give half his character if we had none but the playful ones addressed to his lady friends, or none but the melancholy ones addressed to his spiritual teachers. And therefore there is a strong presumption that Dickens is unfairly described by letters addressed to a gentleman who, it is true, appears to have been to him almost a father-confessor, but who, after all, is only one gentleman. It is plain from this volume, as we might have guessed independently, that Dickens was a voluminous correspondent; he had a very large circle of friends, many very dear to him, and many very distinguished in the world, though none, it may be, dearer or more distinguished than Mr. Forster. At the end of this volume Mr. Forster gives us a list of some of the people who used to dine with Dickens; amongst them and the others who appear more conspicuously in the course of the narrative we find Macleise, Stanfield, Macready, Mr. and Mrs. Procter, Lady Dufferin, Mrs. Norton, Lord and Lady Lovelace, Lord Lytton, Mr. Carlyle, Mr. Tennyson, Captain Marryat, Mazzini, and a great number of others, living and dead, of more or less general reputation. Would it not have increased our knowledge of Dickens if we could have judged for ourselves how he wrote to them or they to him, and thus possibly caught glimpses of some secret recesses of his nature—if such there were—not laid bare to the piercing gaze of Mr. Forster?

The worst of it is that this mode of describing Dickens brings into strong relief the least admirable side of his character. There is one little anecdote which Mr. Forster tells with immense complacency which to our taste very disagreeably illustrates this tendency. "Remember that for my biography, he [Dickens] said to me gravely on Twelfth Day in 1849, after telling me what he had done the night before; and as gravely I now redeem my laughing promise that I would." What Dickens had done would in itself make a pretty little story enough. He had got up in the middle of a cold winter night to practise dancing the polka for the amusement of his little children on a birthday festivity to take place on the morrow. The action was kindly, and such as might find place in a biography as a touching little detail—on one condition; the condition, namely, that it should not have been done with a view to the biography. It is really strange that Mr. Forster does not see how completely he takes the whole grace out of the performance by introducing Dickens in this character. As we now read the anecdote, it looks as though the man was so penetrated to the core with a sense of his own importance that he could not do a simple act of kindness to his children without thinking how it would look in his biography. He gets up in the middle of the night, not out of pure fondness for his little girls, but to exclaim to posterity, Here am I, the great novelist, the mighty portrayer of

human nature, the "inimitable Boz," and, as you will observe with wondering admiration, I am actually like one of you; I have simple natural affections; I am not too dignified to play with my children! If we could accept the story as Mr. Forster tells it, we should say that it was as disagreeable an anecdote as we have often read; and it falls in only too well with the overdone pathos of little Nell and Paul Dombey, and that vein of cheap sentiment which Dickens was too fond of working, and which Mr. Forster admires with a biographer's admiration. We trust, however, and believe that Dickens was at the time perfectly sincere, and only spoke to Mr. Forster in joke, or, at most, from a subsequent perception of the picturesque points of his performance. When a man has done something impressive and whispers to a friend, Just put that down in a book, it is a strange blunder to put down the whisper as well as the action.

In fact, however, we cannot say that Dickens makes an altogether agreeable impression upon us in this volume. Mr. Forster remarks in one place "how great an actor was Dickens lost." To say the truth, the actor is a little too prominent. We do not mean to say that Dickens's feelings were not on all occasions thoroughly genuine. We fully believe that they were; but we cannot avoid thinking also that he was too mindful of the effect he was producing upon the spectators; and, moreover, that he was rather a man of exceedingly versatile and vivid than of very deep emotions. He could represent any character on the stage, as Mr. Forster tell us, with amazing quickness, but he was "greater in quickness of assumption than in steadiness of delineation." His great merit was in assuming a variety of characters in rapid succession, and at one time, as appears from this volume, he thought of giving representations after the pattern of Charles Mathews, in which he would no doubt have succeeded admirably. In his writing as in his acting nobody ever surpassed, or perhaps approached, his quickness of observation; and no one of anything like the same ability was so incapable of penetrating far below the surface. Undoubtedly he had singularly strong temptations. Making an overpoweringly brilliant success in early youth, and ever afterwards flattered beyond all limits, it was natural that he should be content to work the superficial deposits of his mind, without trying to strike a deeper vein. Mr. Forster of course chooses to speak of his high sense of his own importance as illustrating "the resolute self-assertion of great men in great places," and not "the fussy pretension of small men in great places"; and he assures us that "few men have had less" of presumption or self-conceit. We need not quarrel about words; but Dickens had assuredly an opinion of himself which, if not higher than Mr. Forster's, is not likely to be accepted by less idolatrous and less idolized critics. Mr. Forster gives us in this volume a characteristic passage between Dickens and Jeffrey. The old critic, who always warmly admired him, writes him a letter about *Dombey and Son*, such as those which Richardson used to receive from his female correspondents. Truth, delicacy, depth of pathos, and such expressions are used with liberality enough to satisfy any ordinary author; but, at the end, Jeffrey admits that he perhaps does not care enough about "Miss Tox and her Major and the chicks. But you know," he adds, "I always grudge the exquisite painting you waste on such portraits." Dickens comments on this in a letter to Mr. Forster by saying that it is "a strange example of the hazard of writing in parts that such a man as Jeffrey should form his notion of *Dombey* and Miss Tox on three months' knowledge." Presumptuous old man! "I do not at heart," he continues, "lay much real stress on his opinion, though one is naturally proud of awakening such sincere interest in the breast of an old man who has so long worn the blue and yellow." Obviously the least hint, not that a character was positively bad, but that it was unworthy of the "exquisite painting" lavished upon it, was felt by Dickens as indicative of a want of appreciation fatal to the critic's character for acuteness. Very amiable and excellent men have been vain; and this little touch may remind us of Goldsmith's Garriek—"Who peppered the highest was surest to please." But Mr. Forster, unlike Goldsmith, makes it a principle to leave out the shadows when he is painting a portrait. To him everything that Dickens does or says is admirable; his taste is not cloyed by Dickens's sentimentalisms, and he quite seriously accepts Dickens's own belief, that to publish a plentiful effusion of platitudes about "Yuletide" and turkeys and mince-pies and country-dances is the same thing as to strike "a great blow for the poor." As seen from Mr. Forster's point of view, Dickens's anxiety about his own books, the amazing importance which he attaches to them, his apparent conviction that the central figure of this universe is the "inimitable Boz," becomes unduly conspicuous; for Dickens naturally dwells upon such topics to excess in correspondence with a gentleman who appears to have acted as his right-hand man in all literary enterprises. It is amusing to see how thoroughly Dickens remains himself throughout, and how, when sketching with a marvellously quick eye the external oddities of life in Italy or Switzerland—with which much of the present volume is concerned—he always remains the inimitable Boz, and sighs for London streets amidst the palaces of Genoa and under the snows of Mont Blanc. Mr. Forster, as a critic is bound to do, sees the influence of the Alps and Italy in the works written at this time. We confess that our acuteness is not sufficient to enable us to follow him. Everywhere, as it seems to us, Dickens is pursued by the great British public, whose sentiments he expressed with such amazing fidelity, and regards foreigners from the outside as much as Sam Weller or Mrs. Gamp would have done. And everywhere, too, he is thinking, rather

more than is good for him, of the tremendous sensations he is going to produce, and of its importance to the general system of things. Comparing the book with Lockhart's *Life of Scott*, the contrast is not in favour of Mr. Forster. In spite of Scott's follies and delusions, we learn at every page to love the kindly, simple, honourable gentleman. In Mr. Forster's pages we get a little out of patience with the brilliant writer whose one question always seems to be, How am I to dazzle the eyes of cockneys and draw tears from a too sentimental public?

A great deal of this impression, as we must finally repeat, is due to Mr. Forster's method. The real man Dickens seems persistently to elude us. We see him, as it were, talking to a literary friend in a publisher's ante-room, not as he was in domestic life or in his own privacy. We are introduced exclusively to that side of his character which he showed to the judicious adviser in his various enterprises, and it is only by glimpses that we see anything deeper. It is Mr. Forster's fault if we are left in doubt whether there was really something stronger and nobler behind, or whether the brilliant, sensitive, excitable outside was really the whole man.

#### MAUDSLEY AND TUKE ON THE PHYSIOLOGY OF MIND.\*

THE growing attention demanded of late years by the pathology of mental disease invests with deeper interest the study of those laws which regulate the reciprocal action of body and mind. In the works which we have grouped together as recent contributions to this important part of medical theory, we have the views of two able physicians, eminent for their treatment of this class of organic disorder, upon what may be considered the established basis of inquiry, as well as the most advanced stage of conclusion in regard to the philosophy of physical and mental functions. Upon the practical physician, with far more stringency than upon the metaphysical philosopher, is the conjoint study of both these elements in the constitution of man urged as indispensable to the grasp of true and sound results. The metaphysician, as Dr. Maudsley forcibly puts the truth, may for the purpose of speculation separate mind from body, and evoke the laws of its operation out of the depths of self-consciousness. But the physician, who has to deal practically with the thoughts, feelings, and conduct of men—who has to do with mind not as an abstract entity concerning which he may be content to speculate, but as a force in nature the operations of which he must patiently observe and anxiously labour to influence—must recognize how entirely the integrity of the mental functions depends on the integrity of the bodily organization, must acknowledge the essential unity of body and mind. To set forth this unity as the sole basis of any real advance either in the physiology or the pathology of mind has been the chief aim of the author in the Gulstonian Lectures delivered before the Royal College of Physicians during the session of 1870, which we regret to have found no opportunity of noticing before. An amount of special study not to be surpassed within the limits of his profession has been brought to bear upon this important subject, in combination with principles of analysis and construction altogether wider and deeper than any merely professional mode of treatment.

The Lectures, three in number, are occupied (1) with the physical condition of mental functions in health, or the normal relations between body and mind; (2) with certain forms of degeneracy of mind, their causes, and their relation to other disorders of the nervous system, with especial reference to forms of mental disease inherited through the operation of physical causes; (3) with the relations of morbid bodily states to disordered mental functions. Claiming the right to use the inductive method not less freely in dealing with the phenomena of body and mind than in dealing with those of the bodily functions separately or those of inorganic matter, as well as to rise from the simplest to the most complex stages of logical proof, the author would begin with the observation of the most rudimentary instances of mental action, its physiological manifestations in animals, in children, in idiots, in savages, mounting by degrees to the highest and most recondite facts of consciousness, such as have been commonly taken to form the subject-matter of purely psychical philosophy. To fix, indeed, the absolute beginning or starting-point of mental action is as wholly beyond us as to assign the earliest dawn of organic life. Whereabouts in the animal kingdom it first appears, or how low down it is to be traced, even in the nerve functions of man, is a sufficiently embarrassing problem. Is the brain even the exclusive organ of mind? If it be so, to what category, asks Dr. Maudsley, shall we refer the reflex acts of the spinal cord, which take place independently of the brain, and which often achieve as definite an end, and seem to display as intelligent an aim, as any conscious act of volition? Pinch the hind foot of a frog the head of which has been cut off. The limb is withdrawn from the irritation. Touch with acetic acid the thigh of this headless frog over the internal condyle, and the animal rubs it off with the dorsal surface of the foot of the same side. Cut off the

foot, and apply the acid to the same spot, and the animal tries to get at the spot again with its foot, until, as if sensible of the loss, it tries the foot of the other leg, and succeeds in rubbing off the acid. Now these movements are doubtless entirely unconscious and automatic. They are no more evidence of intelligence and will than are the spasmodic actions of coughing, sneezing, or swallowing in man. In the spinal cord are implanted the faculties of such movements, with the obvious design, if design anywhere exists, of self-preservation; and, failing one series of reflex actions, we see their place supplied by another. Albeit no proof of intelligence or volition in the spinal cord, do not these movements, Dr. Maudsley asks, evince the same physiological properties and the operation of the same laws of evolution which govern the development of intelligence and will in the higher centres of nervous and mental force? In man these faculties are not indeed in the same degree innate as in the lower animals, but have to be elicited by education—to be acquired in fact after birth. Still, when acquired or formed by repeated action, they become to a great extent automatic and unconscious, having passed into the constitution of the nerve centres. Mr. Darwin has, we know, accumulated proofs of the mode and degree in which habits thus acquired have become by transmission the property of generation after generation both in the lower animals and in man. In man, owing to his higher organization, that which in the lower animals remains rudimentary or instinctive passes into the more developed form of consciousness, reason, and volition. Yet not a few of the acts of our daily life are gone through automatically, or with but half consciousness. It is a further step when a direct impulse comes down from the brain, forming the act of will. The immediate agency is, as before, in the motor-centres of the spinal cord, since the will does not and cannot act upon the nerve fibres of each muscle individually, but simply gives the order which sets in motion the organized machinery of the motor-centres. And it is in the wide range of action that exists between the ultimate seat or centre which we call mind or will and the external manifestation of force in deed or speech that so much of the disorder or degeneracy of function is wont to occur which issues in the symptoms of madness or idiocy. We may never know what mind really is, but we may advance without limit in investigating the laws which connect the functions of mind with those of the lower sensory and nerve centres; and in the disturbance of those laws we may seek out the seat, and in consequence the treatment, of mental disease.

In his second and third lectures Dr. Maudsley touches briefly, but with clearness and force, upon the classification of mental disorders. These arise in this or that set of organic functions, in hereditary, defective, or arrested brain growth, in vicious excess, in sexual influences, in organic lesions, in shocks to the cerebral system. In addition to the primary genesis of disease by this or that cause in the individual, there arises the important question of the perpetuated or hereditary "neurosis" or maniacal tendency, which is generally to be traced by the intelligent physician in the greater number of insane patients. Striking instances are brought forward of what has been termed the theroid tendency, or the degeneration in point of habit and aspect towards the type of brutes, confirmed as it is by anatomical observation of the inferiority in volume and texture of the brain in idiots of this class. It must be allowed that, after referring all the cases of insanity which we can to bodily causes, and grouping them according to their characteristic bodily and mental features, there remain cases for which we fail to trace any physiological cause, and which we must be content to describe as idiopathic. The explanation of such cases we can but hope with Dr. Maudsley to discover ultimately in the influence of the hereditary neurosis, or in peculiarities of the individual temperament. A latent injury or a bad ancestral influence may, under the pressure of trial or the struggle of life, develop from a simple germ of nervous or organic mischief into confirmed disturbance and derangement of nerve life in its most hidden recesses. What Dr. Maudsley, both here and in his more formal work upon the same subject, most strongly insists upon and fortifies with his closest reasoning and most ripe experience is that the separation of mental disorders from other nervous diseases has been the great bar to their scientific knowledge and treatment. Such disorders are neither more nor less than nervous diseases in which mental symptoms predominate, nor are they to be understood or treated apart from the physiological study of the organism in all its functions. We must get rid first and for ever of the notion of the mind as a metaphysical entity, seated or imprisoned in some corner of the body, or as a dissociated and alien power, fitfully and above all law making itself felt in a lower sphere.

The more formal as well as more ample work of Dr. Hack Tuke approaches the same class of phenomena from the opposite pole of contemplation. Instead of beginning the study of mind with the observation of its humblest bodily manifestations, and tracing the phenomena of mental action in health and disease to their root in the physical organism, Dr. Tuke takes his ground upon the basis of psychology. He starts from the resolution of the mind into its threefold states or elementary forces—intellect, emotion, and volition. Though conscious that the only satisfactory mode of approaching the case would be one founded upon a correct and complete physiology of the brain, or rather of the entire nervous system, he despairs of science being prepared as yet with any precise physiological utterance upon the subject, and is content with the time-honoured distinction of Mind and Body as sufficiently

\* *Body and Mind: an Inquiry into their Connexion and Mutual Influence, specially in Reference to Mental Disorders.* Being the Gulstonian Lectures for 1870. By Henry Maudsley, M.D., Professor of Medical Jurisprudence in University College, London, &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1870.

*Illustrations of the Influence of the Mind upon the Body in Health and Disease; designed to Elucidate the Action of the Imagination.* By Daniel Hack Tuke, M.D., M.R.C.P., &c. London: J. & A. Churchill. 1872.



clear in a popular, if not in a scientific, sense. How little his scheme of treatment admits of exactitude or precision will appear from his emphatically including the special senses "under body, and not under mind, together with all sensations, movements, and organic functions." Keeping up the old familiar dualism, he is haunted by no sense of difficulty in throwing this whole class of phenomena to one side of the traditional, however intangible, boundary line. Mind and body appear as entities not less apart than of yore, although in a mass of empirical cases evidence is brought forward of influence going out from one of these separate entities to the other. "Sensation (general and special) is treated of as being influenced by intellectual, emotional, and volitional states." Yet, ranking as he has done the whole phenomena of sensation under the domain of body, Dr. Tuke passes on to speak of the "mind or brain" influencing, by way of excitement, perversion, or depression, the sensory, motor, vaso-motor, and trophic nerves, and through them causing changes in sensation, muscular contraction, nutrition, and secretion. If mind and brain are to be spoken of as equivalent, or at least alternative, powers, it may be thought hard upon the senses, as being close of kin to consciousness, and consequently to mind, to be bid keep company with what must needs be held the lower member in the partnership of mind with body. Dr. Tuke can even speak of the "vesicular neurine of the encephalic centres concerned in intellectual, emotional, and volitional states of mind," and he describes it as the aim of his book to illustrate the action of the cerebral hemispheres "upon the sensory and motor ganglia, the centre of the sympathetic, and through the outgoing nerves upon the whole body." But he leaves us as much as ever at a loss for any intelligible mode of connexion between the hemispheres of the brain and the strictly mental states. The question whether pure emotion again is or is not a function of the cerebral hemispheres, as well as the question to which of the lower ganglia it should in the affirmative case be assigned, he holds to be open to doubt; though strangely enough he has no doubt that these hemispheres do act upon the ganglia below them, "so far as the intellect and the will are concerned." So widely and sharply drawn a line of physiological severance is far, we venture to say, from being borne out by the cases of morbid action which he has brought together in great numbers in the successive portions of his book. Dr. Tuke has shown himself throughout more conspicuous for patience and method in getting together his illustrations than for philosophic power or acumen in the analysis and resolution of them. Later on in his work, where he lays down more at length his general physiological and psychological principles, he inclines still further towards the view which would disavow and localize the intellectual and the emotional influences; and he justifies the assumption of a special relation between the encephalic region (in particular that part of it called the medulla oblongata) and the emotions, fortifying himself by an approximation to this view on the part of many physiologists (foremost amongst them Dr. Laycock), though he allows that Dr. Maudsley's doctrine is opposed to the theory of local or special connexion between the emotions and the sensory ganglia.

Speculations of this abstract and abstruse kind have, after all, neither solid ground nor practical value in the present state of our knowledge. Of deeper interest and more real importance are the cases which practically illustrate the action of emotion, through whatever channel or vehicle, upon the bodily organism, whether inducing morbid states of the mind or being employed as the medium of cure. Unhappily, there is little that science as yet is able to do towards the curative use of our knowledge of mental influences. No system of psycho-therapeutics deserving the name can be said to exist. The use of the imagination in particular has been left far too largely in the hands of quacks and empirics, who have so traded upon it as to cast a certain stigma of suspicion or reproach upon its employment by the physician. That the force exists in nature there can be no doubt, nor need there be the faintest misgiving as to its sound and beneficial use. In stimulating dormant energy or checking inordinate excitement by some powerful motor cause acting through the emotions, the intellect, or the will, we do but imitate nature, whose spontaneous action in a thousand multifarious cases is authenticated by the valuable compilation of Dr. Tuke, as well as by the long series of medical works of which he appends a list. At the root of every enlightened and conscientious scheme of psycho-therapeutics, as it underlies all that is good in what is known as Braidism, or hypnotism, as well as in the curative use of mesmerism, with its cognate processes, lies the great principle of sustained and voluntary attention. The words of John Hunter—"I can fix my attention to any part until I have a sensation in that part"—Dr. Tuke would see inscribed in letters of gold over the entrance of every hospital for the cure of disease by psychopathy. If in the case of men of the highest mental endowments this influence exists and operates, it is not to be looked upon as a mere weakness in the hysterical or the nervous patient; and if it can be directed at will in the fulness of health and vigour, how much more easily may it be wielded in cases where the energies of mind and body are impaired! Towards a sound and rational system of applying this potent agency in nature one of the most valuable of recent contributions will be found in the carefully compiled work of Dr. Tuke.

## MARGARET OF ANJOU.\*

THESE two volumes would be easier to review if they were either better or worse than they are. About a really good book and about a thoroughly bad book there is always plenty to say. But it is rather dreary work to have to talk about a book which has no special merit either of style or of matter, which neither teaches us much that we did not know before nor yet puts what we did know before in any specially striking light, but which, on the other hand, is not cram full of palpable blunders, nor yet tricked out with all the extravagances of modern fine writing. Our worst charges against Mrs. Hookham are that she puts her matter together in a dull and heavy way, that her style is weak and poor, and that she has not much notion of the difference in value between one authority and another. But she has evidently taken a good deal of real pains, and, if there is a good deal of moralizing and even twaddling, there is no sign of the worse sins of affectation and extravagance. In her praiseworthy zeal to set down all that she has read about her subject, she gives her readers one statement after another—"some writers say this," "some writers say something else"—without any exercise of criticism between the two, sometimes it would seem without finding out that the two statements contradict one another. We look to the bottom of the page, and we see a whole string of names, but without any reference to volume or page, the names being those of contemporary chroniclers and documents, later compilers, and modern critical writers, all jumbled together as if they were all exactly the same in kind and in value. This state of mind, where there is a real striving after research and accuracy, but a seemingly inborn incapacity to find out the right way of setting about the matter in hand, is really almost hopeless. It is much better morally than the state of mind of those who either will not try to learn at all, or will not take pains to learn accurately what they do try to learn; but the result for the reader or the critic is dreary beyond words. Mrs. Hookham gives us nothing particularly to admire and nothing particularly to find fault with. We have nothing to laugh at, nothing to get indignant about, nothing in short to stir up any strong human emotion of any kind. All that Mrs. Hookham gives us is good honest work, according to her measure. She does not, like some of the sisters of the craft, run off into romances and imaginary conversations. We do not know how this lack may affect the general reader; the reviewer would be almost better pleased with an outpouring in the style of Miss Pardoe, because it would at least give him something to say. We have gone carefully through Mrs. Hookham's two volumes, we have made our marks here and there when we came to things that sounded odd, but it is really hardly worth while to go through them in very great detail. When King René in 1453 sets out on one of his attempts to make good his claims upon Naples, Mrs. Hookham tells us that "some write that the Angevin prince came to Geneva with but two vessels." We are curious to know who the writers are, and, for lack of being told, we venture to guess that they did not write Geneva, but Geneva. So again it is odd to be told that Tewkesbury Abbey, Norman arches and all, was founded by Margaret of Anjou; but it is hardly worth while making a longer collection of such things. We might begin to get angry when we read that "Provence was reunited to the Crown" of France under Louis the Eleventh; but we will rather stop and mark the success of the ingenious Frenchman, whoever he was, who gave the words *réunion* and *réunion* that peculiar sense in which the man who picks your pocket might be said to reunite its contents to your own. But the only place where we fairly boil over is where we are told that John—our John Lackland—"invaded and had possession of Angers again in 1206, when Goth-like he demolished its ancient walls." Will Mrs. Hookham tell us what Goth ever demolished any walls or anything else? Fridigern was at peace with stone walls; Theodoric largely built up both walls and other things. Who was the particular Goth who set King John this bad example?

It is of more importance to mark that, when Mrs. Hookham gets to Bishop Reginald Pecock, she largely quotes what other people have said about him, honestly copying the most opposite accounts without seeming to find out that they are opposite. But she seems never to have thought of turning to the *Repressor* itself, that mine of rich fifteenth-century English, to find out what it was that the Bishop really said. So again, we have fair reason to wonder that one who takes upon herself to whitewash Margaret of Anjou should still give us the exploded Yorkist stories about Margaret's being present at the battle of Wakefield and joining in the insults which were, or were not, heaped about the Duke of York. A little critical examination of the authorities might have taught Mrs. Hookham that Margaret was not there, and so she might have made a real point in favour of her heroine. But the queerest things in the book are the beginning and the ending. The *Life and Times of Margaret of Anjou* are ushered in by a summary of the History of Anjou from the beginning, which shows careful reading of the *Gesta Consulum*, but not much power of distinguishing between legend and history, nor much knowledge of the last lights about Angevin and neighbouring matters. Then at the end—by way, we suppose, of giving us the Times as well as the *Life*—come many pages of odds and ends, right and wrong, to the purpose and not to the purpose, which seem like a shovelling out, after the manner of Mr. Mackenzie Walcott, of all that Mrs.

\* *The Life and Times of Margaret of Anjou, Queen of England and France.* By Mary Ann Hookham. 2 vols. London: Tinsley Brothers. 1872.

Hookham had anywhere read about the fifteenth century or anybody who lived in it. The last sentence is not the least remarkable:—

Thus, in the month of April, in 1459, these Privy Seals were issued at the time when the King was at Coventry, raising an army to oppose the Duke of York and the Earl of Salisbury.

We should rather have looked to find this fact recorded at that stage of the book which describes the doings of the year 1459; but here it is, at the very end, as the final wind-up of all Mrs. Hookham's researches.

And now for a word or two about Queen Margaret and her father the good King René. René is one of the people who, in the common Histories of England, flit across us like shadows. There is "the blind old King of Bohemia"; there is "the Duke of Athens"; there is "René, titular King of Sicily"; we fear we must add that one among our own countrymen who rose to a higher place than any other, Richard King of the Romans. All of them are always brought in with an air of unconcern and familiarity, as if everything about them must be clear to the meanest capacity. Yet we have sometimes uncharitably suspected that this way of dealing with them shows that the writer's own notions are anything but clear about a King of Bohemia, a Duke of Athens, a titular King of Sicily, or even a King of the Romans. About René, as he appears in English history, there is something specially shadowy. Why should the daughter of the titular King of Sicily be called Margaret of Anjou, and, if she was Margaret of Anjou, how comes it that one of the conditions of her marriage was the giving up of Anjou by England? If we get any account of René beyond the fact of his being the father of Margaret, it is always some hint at his being a poor creature with a long string of titles and very little money. This is hardly an adequate portrait of good King René, even personally, and it goes a very little way indeed towards giving any notion of his peculiar and very instructive position. As for the man himself, he was, as all the world knows, good King René. Good, it must be remembered, must be taken in the French sense, implying kindness of disposition, but rather implying the absence than the presence of vigour of any kind. René however might not unfairly be called good in the higher sense; at all events, there is nothing bad to say of him, and he seems to have won the love of all whom he came across, whether as a prince or as a man. Mrs. Hookham seems sometimes to think that he was a great man, and sometimes to think that he was not. The truth is that he must have been a very great man indeed if he could have done anything great, in the unhappy position in which he found himself. He was or claimed to be King, Duke, or Count of several considerable States. But of all princes that ever reigned, he was the furthest from having his dominions in a ring fence. He claimed to be, and at one time or another of his life he actually was, King of Sicily—that is, what we should now call King of Naples—Duke of Lorraine, Duke of Anjou, and Count of Provence; to say nothing of the kingdom of Jerusalem, more distant than any. Of each of these, except Jerusalem, he was at one time or another in actual possession, though Provence was the only one which could be said to be permanently his own. In the actual events of his life he was singularly unlucky, for he was driven at one time or another out of nearly all his possessions, and once or twice he was himself a prisoner. But the real ill-luck was in the position itself. What could a man do who held or claimed to hold so many possessions so utterly cut off from one another? The possession of a detached province which is not too far off from the bulk of his dominions may stir up a prince to get hold of the lands which divide the two. This is a process in which Charles of Burgundy failed and Frederick of Prussia succeeded. But Naples, Lorraine, Anjou, and Provence could never be joined together after this fashion. A greater power than all, and external to all, might swallow them up one after another, but they could never come together of themselves. The life of René therefore had to be spent in flitting about from one dominion to another, the flittings being not uncommonly caused by the loss of this or that kingdom or duchy. A man in such a case had no fair chance; but it is certain that, in whatever part of his dominions René stayed for any time, he was always liked by his subjects, and he seems to have been liked best where he was able to stay longest.

But the position of René with these endless scattered territories marks a stage in history. When a man could in this way inherit one principality here and another there, one held of the Pope, another of the Emperor, another of the King of France, it shows how utterly the old notion of a kingdom or principality as an office, as a headship of a people, had passed away into the notion of a mere hereditary estate. But the fact that René found it impossible to keep his scattered possessions shows also that another state of things was coming. The time was fast coming when the days of small kingdoms and duchies were to begin to pass away, and when Europe was to be gathered together in the hands of a few great Powers. In fact the fate of René's own dominions formed no unimportant part of that process. René, like his contemporary Charles of Burgundy, is one of the bridges between one state of things and another. As the champion of Anjou against Aragon, he keeps on the tradition of the strife of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries—the strife of Pope and Cæsar, Guelf and Ghibelline—and he hands it on to become, in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, a strife between the houses of France and Austria. And the mere disposition of his territories went far towards the grouping together the European

states in greater masses. For the appanage of Anjou to return to the Crown of France was nothing very wonderful, though we may stop to throw a word of sympathy to the subjects who had to exchange René for Louis the Eleventh. But the French acquisition of Provence, which followed so shortly after René's death, was one of the great steps in French aggrandizement. It was the greatest territory beyond their own borders that the Perisian kings had ever seized at a single mouthful. The great acquisitions of the reigns of Philip Augustus, of St. Louis, and of Charles the Seventh might fairly be called *réunions*; they were annexations to the Crown of territories that had been held by the Crown; but Provence following upon the Dauphiny of Vienne, as the Dauphiny of Vienne had followed upon Lyons, was the greatest single acquisition that France had yet made, perhaps that she ever made, of Imperial territory. And René himself was again typical of the way in which provinces after province was brought under French influence, was ruled by French princes, and so forth, before its final incorporation with the French Kingdom. The Count of Provence was only one of many vassals of the Empire who practically became vassals of France. The Provençals, at the time of their annexation and long after, most certainly knew that they were not Frenchmen; but, till, two generations later, Cæsar came in person to remind them, we may suspect that they had forgotten that they had anything to render to Cæsar at all.

We have talked so long about the father, and we have found out, in the process of talking, that he had to do with so much greater matters than we at all thought of when we began, that we have little room for the daughter. But perhaps talk about Margaret of Anjou is not very much needed. We should say that Mrs. Hookham had not succeeded in her attempt to "rehabilitate" Queen Margaret; only we do not feel quite sure how far she meant to rehabilitate her. For Mrs. Hookham sways so far backwards and forwards, according to the particular book which she had before her at any time, that it would not be hard to put together several portraits of Margaret out of her book. But if Margaret has been "rehabilitated," we beg leave to put in our own claim as those who have done most in the work. We cannot see that Mrs. Hookham has anywhere done so much for her heroine as we did some months back, when we showed that she had nothing to do with cutting off Duke Richard's head.

#### CLODE ON MILITARY AND MARTIAL LAW.\*

TO those who do not belong to the legal profession law books are usually the very driest of all reading, and a study of military law in particular is in a sense doubly unattractive, for it necessitates an acquaintance with two sets of technical terms. Mr. Clode has, however, done much to clothe with interest the dry bones with which he has had to deal, by giving not only a history of the origin and progress of military law, but also the why and the wherefore of its provisions. It has been officially admitted that there exists a necessity for a simple text-book on this subject, and the work is believed to be now in progress. Till it appears Mr. Clode's work will in a measure supply the deficiency, and even after the publication of an authoritative text-book the volume before us can hardly fail to be a useful supplement to it. For ordinary students it is scarcely fitted, for it deals rather too much with general principles, and furnishes too few practical illustrations to attract young subalterns. The teachers of those young subalterns, officiating and deputy judge advocates, and officers of rank and responsibility, will, however, find this work invaluable. Many civilians have an idea that military law is law only in name; that it is something *en sui generis*, and little more than a collection of traditions for the guidance of those who are called upon to administer the rough and somewhat arbitrary discipline of the army. This notion has been fostered by the circumstance that martial law has, even by the Legislature and the judges, been unaccountably confounded with military law. Of martial law we shall treat in its proper place; but as to military law, it is as much the law of the land, and is as strictly fenced in by rules and forms, as any law administered at Westminster. The author, in a single sentence, accounts for the extraordinary delusions which exist on this subject. "Raised," he remarks, "as the army originally was, under an influence supposed to be antagonistic to freedom, the people have willingly remained ignorant of the peculiar laws and institutions under which both officers and soldiers were governed." The intention of the successive architects who have gradually built up a Military Code was not that those subject to it should be deprived of any safeguards to their innocence or protection against oppression, but that certain crimes which, although in civil life of minor importance, in military life endanger the very existence of an army, should be treated rather according to their effects than according to the amount of moral guilt which they involve, and also that a more prompt and energetic repression of crime should be possible than is compatible with the machinery of civil law. The necessity for exceptional legislation in dealing with soldiers was fully recognized by the Legislature when the Military Murders Act was passed a few years ago; and every reader of history must admit that on the maintenance of a strict discipline depends the safety of every citizen in the country. The Lord Chief Justice of

\* *The Administration of Justice under Military and Martial Law.* By Charles M. Clode, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. London: John Murray. 1872.



England, in a note to the printed report of his charge to the grand jury on the trial of Colonels Nelson and Brand for putting Mr. Gordon to death, observes:—"The great advantage of the military procedure appears to be that it avoids the delays incidental to our system of administering justice periodically, so that punishment follows speedily upon crime, and so operates more effectually to deter." Differing, however, as military law does from ordinary law in its procedure, in the severity of some of its punishments, in the discretion as to awards granted to the judges who administer it, in the fact that the jury decides by a majority, and does not consist of the mystic number of twelve, and, finally, in that there is no localization of crime, it is nevertheless equally law, and is founded on identically the same principles.

A very important point in connexion with military law is the question as to how far a man in entering the military service of the Crown loses the ordinary rights and privileges of citizenship. In our opinion there can be no doubt that an officer or soldier on embracing the profession of arms enters into an implied contract to surrender all social privileges which are inconsistent with the maintenance of exact discipline, and consequently with the public welfare. How much or how little of this contract is to be exacted depends partly upon the circumstances of the time, partly upon the temper of the nation, but mainly upon ability to enforce orders on the subject. The late Sir Robert Peel said that "it would be utterly impossible to maintain discipline if soldiers were allowed to be political partisans, correspondents to newspapers, or members of political clubs. . . . He denied the truth of the doctrine that a soldier continues to enjoy *all* the rights of a citizen. It was clear that he must forfeit that portion of his civil rights which would interfere with the discipline of the army." The principle enunciated by Sir Robert Peel is accepted, though not acted on to its full extent, by the military authorities of the present day. The Carlton, the Reform, and Brooks's are undoubtedly political clubs, yet they number among their members many officers on full-pay. Again, the Queen's Regulations lay down the rule "that the practice of making anonymous complaints or publishing anything through the medium of the press calculated to excite discontent in the army is strictly prohibited." As a matter of fact, anonymous complaints against military superiors are rare; but such is not the case with regard to the acts of the War Office. Even if it were otherwise, we do not see how the practice could well be stopped, for it would be almost impossible to discover the offenders. The authorities therefore act wisely in maintaining the broad principle, without making attempts which would be necessarily futile to apply it.

In addition to the Mutiny Act, which is passed annually, the written part of the Military Code comprises the Articles of War, which the Mutiny Act empowers the Sovereign to make, and which at the present day are always, though not necessarily, re-issued every year. These Articles of War are, in fact, an amplification of the Mutiny Act, but they must contain nothing at variance with the provisions of that Act. Further guidance in minor matters is also provided by the Queen's Regulations, but the Mutiny Act and the Articles of War are alone taken judicial cognisance of by civil courts. The unwritten portion of the Military Code consists of the customs of war, as established by a series of precedents, many of which have been allowed by the most eminent civil judges. It will thus be seen that military justice is as clear, as thoroughly formulated, and as distinctly limited by rules and forms as civil law, and is not, as some persons imagine, rough and ready hand-to-mouth law extemporized by those whose duty it is to administer it.

The history of the gradual growth of the Military Code is traced in a very able and interesting manner by Mr. Clode. Some of the earlier regulations are curious, and throw light on the social habits of the day. In the first Mutiny Act, passed in 1689, which was but slightly altered or added to till the peace of Utrecht, it is laid down that no court-martial shall sit "but between the hours of eight in the morning and one in the afternoon." We suspect that there was no certainty that the members would be strictly sober save between those hours. Another noteworthy fact in connexion with the earlier Mutiny Acts is that in the 6th and 7th of William and Mary a clause was introduced providing that no officer of the President's regiment should sit or vote on a court-martial. In the twelfth year of Anne's reign "death as a punishment was altogether withdrawn from the Military Code; and this leniency was the chief cause (if we may believe the Duke of Newcastle, speaking before Parliament in 1749), of the rebellion of 1715." Originating in a feeling of mercy, this change was really productive both of undue severity in some cases, and of powerlessness on the part of the Crown to inflict proportionate punishment in others. "The Crown thus became powerless to suppress the political action of the army in favour of the Pretender, through the agency of the military tribunals." In 1715 three successive Mutiny Acts were passed. The last of these restored the punishment of death, and permitted courts-martial to award capital or other punishment for every offence. Two years later we find the first express mention in a Mutiny Act of flogging. Up to 1712 the army beyond the seas was governed by Articles of War enacted by the sole and inherent authority of the Sovereign; but in that year his authority to enact them was formally recognized, and in 1715 he was expressly empowered, in very wide terms, to make Articles of War for "the better government of the forces at home." We may con-

gratulate ourselves on being better than our forefathers in some things at least when we learn that the 52nd Article of War in Queen Anne's reign ordered that the officers on court-martial duty should be sworn "not to receive any present or gratuity, directly or indirectly, for the discharge of their office."

Quitting this part of the subject, we come to the military law of the present day; and, though Mr. Clode has done his best to clear up obscurities, we must confess that a more cumbersome, obscure, verbose thing than the code which prevails in 1872 can scarcely be conceived. To lawyers it may possibly be intelligible; but to the officer it appears hopelessly confused, and calculated rather to facilitate the acquittal than the conviction of the guilty. For this the Judge Advocate General's department is alone responsible. Military men have shown a tendency to look on courts-martial as courts of Equity, in which matters were to be decided rather on their merits than according to technical rules. Naturally enough Mr. Clode condemns this view, though it is the view adopted by no less eminent persons than the Duke of Wellington and Sir Charles Napier. We may here mention that Mr. Clode lays down a dogma which is at variance with precedents accepted by some of the soundest lawyers who ever sat on the Bench. He asserts that the members of a court-martial are not liable to civil actions for abuse of power or illegal proceedings. Simmons holds the contrary doctrine, and maintains that both collectively and individually they are so responsible, and he quotes a case in which in 1743 Lieutenant Frye of the Marines obtained a verdict of 1,000*l.* damages against the president of the court which tried him. A recent decision of the late Mr. Justice Willes, however, to the contrary effect leaves the matter still in doubt. It is clearly desirable that there should be no uncertainty on the subject, and that military courts should in this matter enjoy the same safeguard as civil tribunals.

A very important section of this book is that which treats of martial law; and here we find a most lamentable absence of definite rules. As martial law can only be justified by extreme necessity, and by the impossibility of dealing with offenders by means of the ordinary tribunals, it is of course difficult to say when it ought and when it ought not to come into operation; but we need not here deal with that question. It is the civil governor, not a military officer, who proclaims martial law, and the latter has only to consider in what manner, and to what extent, he may best carry it out. Here, however, arises a difficulty—namely, What is martial law? It certainly is not military law, for that as administered by military officers affects only military men, and its rules and limits are laid down in the Mutiny Acts and the Articles of War, whereas martial law affects civilians as well as soldiers, and is destitute of a code. Martial law may be briefly described as the natural means employed by a constituted government to maintain its authority when public disorders have silenced all other law. *Inter arma silent leges.* How then is it to be administered? The Duke of Wellington described it as simply the will of the general. The Mutiny Act has therefore nothing to do with martial law, for this owes its very existence to the forced suspension of all regular law. The law officers of the Crown, when advising Sir Harry Smith in 1848 at the Cape, stated that the Mutiny Act did not necessarily regulate the sentences of courts-martial assembled under martial law; and Mr. Clode seems, and we think rightly, to consider that the chief military authority may punish without the intervention of courts-martial. Sir D. Dundas, the Judge Advocate General in 1850, expressed an opinion that "an officer cannot go very wrong who adheres as closely as the circumstances will permit him to the mode of administering the law under the Mutiny Act." This is, however, only an opinion, though it is evident that, by employing courts-martial and adhering as far as possible to the usual procedure of military law, a general takes a prudent precaution to ensure justice and to diminish his own moral responsibility. Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, in his charge to the grand jury in the case of Colonel Nelson, tried for the execution of Gordon in Jamaica, took a widely different view from that entertained by other authorities, and endorsed in this instance by the grand jury itself. He altogether denies that there is any distinction between military and martial law, though how the provisions of the Mutiny Act can be made applicable to civilians does not appear. He also asserts that civilians dealt with under martial, or as he insists upon terming it military, law have a right to be tried by courts-martial as regularly constituted as if they were assembled for the trial of soldiers. It is a scandal that there should be any room for doubt on such a matter; but as regards an officer's practical duty there can be no doubt whatever, and he cannot do better than impress upon his memory the following extract, with which we close our notice of Mr. Clode's valuable book:—

Given a Proclamation of Martial Law, issued by the Crown under the advice of Responsible Ministers, his duty should be to carry the same into effect firmly, fearlessly, and above all things, justly; being sure that, do as he may, he never will escape censure: if he causes death, some may charge him with manslaughter; or should he refrain from so doing, then others will blame him for neglect. The position is one of great responsibility, and therefore to hit the precise line of duty in such cases is most difficult.

## PRENDERGAST'S MASTERY SERIES.\*

ON a first glance at Mr. Prendergast's books one is tempted to assume that his method is only a new variety of the genus of Ollendorffs, Conversation-Grammars, books of Travel Talk, and other contrivances for learning, or pretending to learn, languages off hand. These productions are indeed not without their use. No grammar or language-book can well be so bad that something may not be done with it by teachers and learners who have the wit to disregard its precepts and arrangement and use the materials according to their own judgment. Any and every collection of words and phrases may be turned to account for the end of getting familiar with the look of a new language, and gaining knowledge of the vocabulary; and perhaps nearly as much may be learnt by dabbling in any of the common phrase-books at home as by spelling out theatrical and official notices, shop-fronts, and the like abroad. It may be that the phrases in the books are not always of the best; but then the writing of directors, officials, and advertisers generally is not famed for purity and elegance even in more artistic countries than England. Day after day the Hof-theater of Dresden announces the time and place of selling tickets in a sentence which not only is monstrously long and clumsy but breaks a positive rule of construction. If the directors of public taste write bad German, what shall the righteous do, unless they will be content to understand the foreigner and make themselves understood by him without troubling themselves much about elegance? So that, if Mr. Prendergast had done no more than turn out some new books of sentences no worse than the rest, we should see no occasion to quarrel with him.

But what he has done is, in fact, very different. The *Mastery of Languages*, as he calls the method which he claims to have invented or perfected, is not a pretence or shadow, but a definite and intelligible method resting on grounds which have a good deal of truth in them. We must admit that we do not attach quite so much importance to the details of his method as he seems to do himself, especially in the case of adult learners. Our own advice to an intelligent person of years of discretion, already knowing one or two tongues besides his own, and wishing to learn yet another, would stamp us, we fear, as brutally unscientific in the eyes of most professors. It would be to this effect—Get over the first rudiments as best you can; if you can learn them by word of mouth with a competent teacher whom you like, so much the better. If you have any turn that way, as every student of languages ought to have, seek for information as to the family history of the language, more especially if it is akin to your own, and mark in the new forms you deal with the analogies to those you know already. The labour will be infinitely lightened, and the dry bones of grammar will be clothed with living flesh and blood. Then, as soon as you can make out continuous sentences at all, take up some book not unreasonably difficult, not technical, and on a subject that interests you. Read it with a dictionary or translation, or both, till you have made out the author's vocabulary and style and can go on without. In difficulties refer to a skilled friend, or in extremity to a grammar. Repeat this, if need be, with two or three books of different kinds, and the rest will take care of itself. You will have learnt unconsciously the minutiae and anomalies of the accidence, and the main part at least of the syntax; and you will afterwards be able to read a systematic grammar with the prospect of understanding it. Not only adults out of school do in fact follow this course, but schoolboys do much the same, those at least who really learn the languages their masters teach them. They are made to waste priceless time by pretending to learn the grammar and syntax before they are allowed to see the language alive; but what is learnt in this forced and unnatural way is mostly forgotten, and the memory really trusts to what has been gathered by comparison, illustration, and explanation in the course of intelligent reading. One person whose fate it has been to read and write as much Greek and Latin as most classically educated Englishmen assures us that from the time he began to read with any ease and continuity he never called to mind any one rule in the form in which it stood in the grammar. Indeed he somehow escaped learning Wordsworth's Greek Syntax altogether, and was never the worse for it.

So far we agree with Mr. Prendergast that "the mode of initiation practised in our best schools is very uncertain in its results, and intolerably tedious both to teachers and learners." We also agree with him that it cannot be right to learn Latin and Greek one way and modern languages another way, on the absurd supposition that the former are dead and the latter living; and we further agree that the present scholastic method—which some schoolmasters actually want to extend to modern languages—is distinctly wrong. And Mr. Prendergast seems to agree with us that, when the first struggle with the rudiments is over, it is a matter of discretion in each case how best to go on. The question remains open—What is the most hopeful plan for attacking the rudiments? and this is the question Mr. Prendergast undertakes to answer. We plead guilty to the heresy of thinking that from the very outset there is much room for discretion, and that wise teachers and willing and ready learners will make out between them the plan that suits them best if they are once left free to do so. But not all teachers or learners answer to these descriptions, and human nature is strangely fond of something in the shape of a pre-existing order to work upon, and will take huge trouble to avoid starting afresh—a fact which accounts, not only for grammars,

but for most of the strange things to be found in the manners, customs, and constitution of this country. And if a formula there must be, Mr. Prendergast's is more elastic and reasonable than most others. He aims at securing by an artificial process the advantages of the natural process; that is, he wants to make pupils learn a new language not less quickly and easily than intelligent children learn it when they are placed at the most favourable age—which Mr. Prendergast says is about seven—among those who speak it. The leading points of the method are these:—It begins not with words, but with whole sentences; the sentences being idiomatic, and such that they can be readily broken up into shorter ones, and the pieces varied and interchanged. The lessons are to be oral, short, and frequent. Everything is to be learnt by heart, but no rules or technical names mentioned. Jack Cade might be Mr. Prendergast's pupil and never be shocked by hearing of a noun and a verb. New words and forms are brought in gradually, and each sentence is to be thoroughly known before the next is begun. And the combinations once learnt are not to be dropped, but to be fixed in the memory by constant repetition. Long sentences are preferred to short ones, for the reason that they afford frames into which a greater number of variations can be fitted. The resemblances between this and the process of picking up a language by listening and talking are obvious enough; the difference is that, while the learner in a strange country is confused with a multitude of new sounds and can assimilate only a small part of what he hears, Mr. Prendergast's method claims to present him with no more at a time than he can take in with certainty; so carefully is this insisted on, that if possible the teacher is to keep the book during the first few days, and the learner not to see it at all, lest he should look on ahead and confuse himself.

There has scarcely been time as yet to test the method by actual results. The French and German handbooks already issued have gone through several editions, but unhappily that proves very little as things are now. However, Mr. Prendergast has won good opinions from persons who speak with more or less authority on the matter, and he has clearly made out a case for an extended trial of his plan. There can be little doubt that for the purpose of acquiring complete command of a limited vocabulary nothing better could well be devised. A learner who has gone conscientiously through one of these books ought at the end to have everything in it at the tip of his tongue. And we can suppose that even one knowing something of the language in a general way might find it worth while, if he wanted for some special purpose to get up some special set of words, such as the terms of art proper to a science or business, to make himself familiar with them by Mr. Prendergast's plan. But when all is said, it is still a long way from the nursery-garden of the teacher to the native forest of the language itself as it lives in the outer world. The "Mastery" system claims to establish a base of operations which will make the conquest of the unknown country easier; but we cannot believe that it will wholly do away with the necessity for doing stubborn work sooner or later.

So far Mr. Prendergast's ideas. They appear to be well carried out in the books which he has issued; and certainly the French and German sentences are more sensible than what one usually finds in dialogue-books. It might take one's breath away to plunge into this as a first introduction to German:—"Da er, der junge Freund des reichen Mannes dem Diener den Brief nicht hat geben wollen, so werden Sie mir ihn gleich holen lassen müssen." But it has been explained that long sentences are chosen on purpose, and this is to be learnt only in little bits.

The last addition to the series is a Latin book. We confess to a certain jealousy for the sake of our old friend *Henry's First Latin Book*, which has much in common with the new invention, and has done much good work. Instead of the mythical architect Balbus, we find in the first page one Philip, the doctor's friend, who seems to be eminent as a gossip. After a few more pages we gather that the scene of the conversations is a country house on a wild frontier, where Parthians, panthers, ill-behaved slaves, fires, and other exciting facts—carefully confined, however, to the second declension—are the subjects of various startling incidents, in the first conjugation only. A good point is the Appendix of "Couplets"—i.e. pairs of sentences constructed on identical models, so that all the words are interchangeable and continue to make sense. These, if properly worked, cannot fail to be useful, either with or without the other features of the system. However, the broad ground on which we wish success to Mr. Prendergast's innovation is that he sees the necessity of teaching Latin as a living language if the teaching of it is to be preserved. There is one relic of barbarism which we are sorry to see. The learner is told to pronounce Latin in the monstrous fashion which we have all submitted to in this generation—all Protestants at least—but which is now happily in a way to be cast off. So long as English boys go on pronouncing Latin like English, they can never realize it as a language that was talked by living men in cities which you may not merely look out in classical atlases and dictionaries but find still mighty on the earth if you go and see them. Mr. Prendergast and the public schoolmaster who undertook the execution of his Latin manual are strangely timid in this particular, being so bold in all else; and they have missed an opportunity of advancing a good work which we believe to be no matter of mere taste or fancy, but important for the whole substance and spirit of classical education.

\* *The Mastery Series*. Latin. By Thomas Prendergast, author of "The Mastery of Languages," &c. London: Longmans & Co. 1872.



## MURRAY'S HEREFORDSHIRE.\*

A SCHOOL inspector, after a two miles' walk ankle-deep in fallen leaves to a Herefordshire village school in the present autumn, received as an answer to the question for what purpose Adam and Eve were placed in the garden of Eden, the most natural response under the circumstances, "to sweep up the leaves." At whatever point the tourist enters the county the feature which first strikes him is woodland everywhere, diversifying hill and lawn and vale alike. To say nothing of the fine specimen trees at Brampton Bryan, Croft, and Shobdon, at Moccas, Holme Lacy, Harewood, and a host of other parks and country seats—oaks that have numbered more centuries than man numbers decades of years, and giant elms that show how kindly they have taken to the soil—the wooded slope or cone, the timber belt that marks a boundary, the well-sized wood (there are not many forests proper), and the pasture field with its abundance of leafy shade from the trees that seem natural to it, all justify the truth of old Fuller's quaint affirmation, that "in the alphabet of our English commodities this county doth exceed in W, for wood, wheat, wool, and water." The most casual glance from right to left on any of the routes of this Handbook—say, for example's sake, Route 33, from Hereford to Leominster and Ludlow by rail—might suffice to prove the correctness of this dictum, so far at least as its foremost "W" is concerned. To the left as you leave Hereford a sight is caught of Credenhill's wooded camp; a little further, on the same side, is the conical Robin Hood's Butts, or Canon and King's Pyon; whilst to the right the historic Sutton Walls, where was once Offa's palace and the scene of Ethelbert's murder, is itself a woodland eminence. At seven miles from Hereford the railway dives under Dinmore Hill, and in so doing hides from the traveller a large part of some four miles' extent of wood, at the summit of which, as Leland might rightly say, is "a specula to see all the country about." Emerged from the tunnel, and nearing Leominster, the tourist by rail has the well-timbered demesne of Hampton Court to the right, and, when he has passed it, that of Croft to the left, and Berrington to the right. Before he reaches Ludlow he has a wooded undulating stretch of fifteen hundred acres to pass to the left, named Haywood, which we are glad to find that the author of the Handbook has no hesitation in identifying with the scene of Milton's *Comus*. We have more than once protested against the likelihood of the counter theory that the Lady Alice Egerton could have been lost by her brothers in the Haywood Forest, near Hereford, and conveniently found and transported to her father's official residence at Ludlow. Other routes might be shown to present as large a variety in woodland; and if, to the surface covered with forest trees, we add the area of fruit-tree plantations, Herefordshire will have vindicated its right to be designated as the Garden of England—"garden" being understood of trees and shrubs rather than of flowers, although the flora of the county is by no means scanty or meagre. To enter Herefordshire in May is to find the orchards one blush of blossom beauty. It is scarcely less gardenlike in its display of ruddy fruitage in September. The deep argillaceous soils of the county suit admirably the apple and the pear, and if the grower will but recruit his orchard from time to time with new varieties from seed, so as to provide against the inevitable tendency to decay and deterioration, he will do his part to maintain at once the charm and the prosperity of the county. For the juice which is pressed from this fruit is so abundant and famous that an old topographer tells in the same volume of its having been passed off upon the French by an English ambassador as a rare wine from some foreign country, and he describes the apple-trees at Rotherwas, the seat of the Bodenhamas, as being so numerous "that if a man took but one apple from each tree, he would have enough at last to make a hog's head of cyder." Indeed the cider, which Philips has celebrated in song, and localized at Kentchurch, Brinsop, Withington, Burghill, Sutton, &c.—he might have taken whole districts in the Ledbury and Bromyard country *en masse*—is compared by such prosaic authorities as the *Agricultural Journal*, quoted in p. 37 of this Handbook, with the wines of the Rhine and the Moselle, the Barland or Barland perry being said to resemble champagne. If so, it were no great stretch of Fuller's conceit to count the Herefordshire wine as its fifth commodity beginning with a "W," though we spare our reader his arguments for the county to be rechristened Pomerania.

To return to the woods of Herefordshire, it must be noted that to their extent and kindly growth from of old is due another feature which cannot but strike the traveller, and which greatly enhances the picturesqueness of the scenery—we mean its "timber houses." To the circumstance that, until railways facilitated the transit of her timber to Liverpool and Staffordshire and elsewhere, the oak and elm of Herefordshire were a drug in the narrow local market, are due no doubt the triumphs of domestic architecture which still rear their quaint forms in such old towns and villages as Ledbury, Leominster, Orleton, Bosbury, Weobly, and Pembridge. The last but one of these places is a sleepy old town three or four miles to the north of the Morehampton Station on the Hereford, Hay, and Brecon Railway, and those who happen to have Twiss's *Life of Lord Eldon* may be interested to read in it that, when a young barrister, he was elected for this "scot and lot" borough through the influence of Lord Weymouth, and through adhering to the usual mode of procedure there—viz. to kiss the prettiest girl in

the place before and after the election. Though the borough was disfranchised in 1832, and the grass grows in its pitched streets, a sufficient number of the picturesque timber houses still survive to render it well worth a deviation from the straight course through the district; and the drawings of the late Lady Frances Harcourt, which were lent by her some years back to the local Museum of the Cambrian Archaeological Society, might, if they were published, show what a wealth in this kind of architecture the old borough possessed. The old Butter Cross at Leominster, a splendid example of this kind, has been re-erected at the Grange, so that it cannot but attract the passenger by rail; but the still more remarkable Market Hall of the Cathedral city was sacrificed by the citizens for the charm of a broad and open square, about the time when the convergence of railways to what had hitherto been rather "a sleepy hollow" redoubled its trade and traffic, and led them to set more store by room to move than by old-fashioned edifices. Not many strangers, we imagine, turn aside from the Leominster and Ludlow line to visit the village of Orleton to the left of it, although it gave a name to Adam de Orleton, a celebrated bishop and leader in the Barons' war against Edward II., the author of the oracular line addressed to the governors of Berkeley—

Edvardum occidere nolite timere bonum est—

the ambiguity of which consisted in an unclerly contempt of punctuation. But there are other inducements besides this souvenir to turn aside and reconnoitre Orleton. A timber mansion of the sixteenth century, called the Court, was the seat of a Herefordshire worthy, Thomas Blount, the author of a well-known book on "Jocular Tenures," who was buried in Orleton Church chancel in 1679. "The room on the first-floor, once the principal chamber, has its ceiling supported by arched and panelled beams, with a good chimney-piece. There is another very picturesque timber house in the village, having eight gables, of a still earlier date." It is singular that Murray's Handbook should have ignored the timber houses of Weobly as well as Pembridge, inasmuch as they are the characteristic feature of both. In the account of the latter place, a quaint old town that has seen better days, though the parish still boasts several of the chief breeders of "Hereford" cattle, notice is taken of the detached belfry of the church, which is upreared on wooden-framed work, the principal supports being huge oak trees, roughly squared, and so set up on end. Whilst upon the mention of this old town, it is worth supplementing the Handbook by the record that the Byletts, an ancient seat situate on its outskirts, belonged in the civil wars to the loyal family of the Lochards, and that seven or eight sons of the house died in the struggle fighting for the King against the Parliament. It was a canon named Lochard, as we find in Duncumb's History, who in 1438 put up the great west window at Hereford Cathedral, "*proprio costagis et expensis*," from which it should seem that the name, now extinct, was an ancient and honoured one in the county annals.

But the diversity of wood and lawn with hill and vale which marks the aspect of the whole county receives added beauty from rivers and streams. The Wye, with its hare-like doubles and turns, has to be crossed five times by rail betwixt Ross and Hereford, and its serpentine twists and turnings, when it has passed Kerne Bridge and nears the Caldwell Rocks and Symond's Yat, make it one of the most devious, as it is one of the most romantic, combinations of river scenery in England. But the tour of the Wye is one that is not apt to be overlooked, though probably Gilpin's "Observations" upon it, which, though published in 1770, are full of hints and criticisms very useful to the lover of the picturesque even at the present day, are seldom consulted except in old-fashioned libraries. One unforgotten resting-place in the Wye tour is Goodrich, where, overlooking the Wye on opposite sides of a dingle, are the ivy-clad ruins of an historic castle of the twelfth century, and the sham-ancient castellated court, with its Edwardian gateway and portcullis, erected by Sir Samuel Rush Meyrick in 1828-31. The latter is best seen from the turnpike road, the former towers sheer above the river. The antiquary who built the Court would fain have bought the Castle in order to occupy himself with restoring it, and had already vainly sought to purchase Hergest Court, the ancient residence of the Vaughans, near Kington, before he solaced himself with a sham antique wherein to arrange his collection of armour. The next river in importance of the county is the Lugg, which, rising near Knighton, flows by Presteign to Leominster, then southward to Hampton Court, and past Bodenham and Marden to Hereford, near which it falls into the Wye at a little distance from Mordiford. Its scenery and associations might form a very pretty chapter in a new volume of "Rambles by Rivers," as also might those of the Teme and the Monnow, the former of which encloses the north-east of Herefordshire from Brampton Bryan to Tenbury, whilst the latter divides in some measure the counties of Hereford and Monmouth. A more beautiful bit of wild and wooded river scenery than the course of the Teme through the narrow gorge within the grounds of Downton Castle could hardly be desired by any artist or lover of scenery; and there are reaches of the Teme, above and below Ludlow, of exceeding beauty. This river is not unknown to the disciples of Isaac Walton for its trout and grayling; indeed the Leintwardine Club has a fame beyond the borders of Herefordshire. The Lugg, too, and the less pretentious Arrow, which flows past Hergest and Kington into Lugg, near Leominster, are much frequented by fishermen; and these, with lesser rivulets and rills, diversify the landscape as it is seen from some of the famous old camps which overlook the Herefordshire

\* A Handbook for Travellers in Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, and Herefordshire. New Edition, with Map and Plans. London: John Murray. 1872.

valleys, and mark the last stages of the struggle of Caractacus with the Roman general, Ostorius Scapula. This struggle consisted in a gradual falling back on the part of the British chief from the country of the Ordovices, into which he had led his Silures, to preserve his own domain from the calamities of war, first to the fortresses of the Malvern range, and then to divers border camps, such as Wapley and Croft Ambrey. The Roman camp on Dinedor Hill, near Hereford, retains the Roman general's name, under its vulgar designation as Oysterhill; and Credenhill, on the north of the city, was another double-ditched entrenchment, formed, it should seem, to protect the Roman station of Kentchester or Magna Castra. It has been noticed that, except at this latter station, there are no such tokens of Roman villas or isolated dwellings as are still to be found in Gloucestershire. There was less opening for peaceful occupation, and the British camps exhibit a strength and system of resistance impressing the explorer with a high idea of the military talents of their constructors. Croft Ambrey is an elliptical encampment with a double ditch and rampart, and a grand look-out over thirteen counties; and with Wapley, which is six or seven miles nearer Kington, represents the most southern of Caractacus's interior line of forts, which commences at Hên Dinas on the north. It is on the Croft Castle estate; and its first name connects it with a family which held it from the time of Edward the Confessor till that of George III., playing no insignificant part in the intermediate county history. "Ambrey" is said to be a name derived from Ambrosius, a British hero, and it is to be met with still as a surname on the Wye side and about Herefordshire. The elliptical camp at Wapley, a mile or two north of Pembridge station, is as fine as the Ambrey, or finer. It is entered from the south, but several breaches have been made in the works. Its banks and ditches are five-fold, except to the north, where it is impregnable by reason of its beetling steep, and looks down upon the Presteign valley and the Radnorshire border. Here the vallum is only single. An ever-flowing reservoir still exists within it. Wapley belongs to the Eywood property, which, as well as Brampton Bryan, came, on the death of the sixth Earl of Oxford, to his sister, Lady Langdale, whose death, with that of her sister and successor in the last few months, leaves but two direct representatives of the fifth Earl. But we must follow Caractacus, though, as the track is through the Harley property, our digression is not unjustifiable. Ostorius forced him back upon a stronghold, which Tacitus describes in his *Annals* (xii. 35) with wonderful minuteness, and which is now generally admitted to have been Coxwall Knoll, in the immediate vicinity of Brampton Bryan, and about three miles west of Brandon Camp, the Roman station of Bravinum, which Ostorius occupied as a counter work. In the valley where the British entrenchment may still be traced—"very unlike any other example of castrametation in the whole chain of border forts, in its sort of double camp, as though one part had grown out of the other"—and on the boundary of Salop and Hereford was fought the decisive battle between the Silurian chief and the Roman general, A.D. 52. Antiquaries and Archaeological Societies are no doubt familiar with the whole situation, which we observe that the last English editor of Tacitus, Mr. Frost, accepts as the scene of the last battle of Caractacus. Instead of following the Romans and the Britons in their strife, a tourist might alternatively elect to pursue the course of the Ditch which Offa raised to keep the Welsh from the country between Wye and Severn, under the Heptarchy. It may be traced from Bridge Solers and Mansel Gamage, near Hereford, to Knighton. Or he might visit the battle scenes of Edwardian times, or yet again, the local historical scenes during the civil wars of Charles I., when so many staunch and loyal gentlemen of Herefordshire earned a barren honour, the Order of the Oak.

Of Fuller's other W's there is not much to be said at the present day. We do not know that Herefordshire wheat is either grown in more bushels to the acre than that of other counties, or that her arable land is more a source of wealth than her pastures, which certainly in these latter days have been the nurseries of a breed of cattle famous, if not for first-rate milkers, yet for earlier ripeness, earlier putting on of meat and fat, than any other breed. The Herefords, indeed, have quite eclipsed the fame that in the agricultural world belonged in the old days of the county to its breed of sheep—a fame which made the wool of the Ryeland district, between Ross and Hereford, equal in estimation that of merino, and made "Leominster ore" a poetical and proverbial synonym for the silken fleeces of Leominster and its neighbourhood. The Ryeland's breed is extinct, and we are not aware that Leominster entertains any longer a grudge against Worcester and Hereford for having contrived in Leland's time to get the market day changed from Saturday to Friday, and so caused its trade in wool and cloth to decline. There are no cloth-works or mills in the place. Our space does not allow any notice of the numerous country seats and noble parks, or of the fine ecclesiastical buildings, of this border county. But with Murray's enlarged Hand-book the stranger will be enabled to make acquaintance with its points of interest in the most compendious way; and let us hope that in the hands of natives it may serve as the nucleus and framework of a continuation of Duncumb's unfinished History, or, if not exactly that, at least as an incentive to its completion.

## AT HIS GATES.\*

MRS. OLIPHANT always writes well, but, like every one else, she is not always at her best, and there are times when she flags after the manner of her weaker sisters. We are glad to say that *At His Gates* is not one of her second-class efforts. Though it has its own special defects in method, it is, we think, the best thing she has yet done in intention, and some of the characters come up to a very high standard. It is diffusely and, in the beginning, even carelessly written; disfigured with slipshod grammar, and with an uncomfortable dragging of the story which suggests the stagnant fancy and weary hand of an author not yet warmed to the work; but the characters of Helen Drummond and Clara Burton are so thoughtfully studied, so fresh, so natural, and yet so original, that no one whose art of criticism goes beyond microscopic attention to phrases can fail to admire work of so much breadth of excellence. If the story could be a little compressed, and what artists call pulled together, it would be almost the best that Mrs. Oliphant has yet turned out; and to say this of an author who has written so much and so well as she has done is to give commendation in the strongest form in which it can be given.

*At His Gates* is by no means made up of virtue only. It has its full complement of rascality, pure and simple; and even its amiable people are not without their little faults and blemishes, according to the way of human nature. Of the bad men figured by our author the worst two are of the class of City swindlers; thieves in broadcloth who pick pockets by means of bubble shares and unsound schemes, and who bring thousands of innocent folks to ruin that their own coffers may be filled. Mr. Baldwin, too, the "lay bishop" of a denomination which puts its salvation in doctrine, but does not give much heed to the filthy rags of righteousness, is by no means the saint he appears; but his failings, which consist chiefly in the contradiction existing between his Christian precepts and his private practice, are mild compared with those of the former worthies. Mr. Burton, the prosperous merchant, with his high-stepping bays, his ostentatious benevolence, and the very aggressiveness of wealth in all his words and works, is the chief actor in the drama of rascality that is enacted; though Golden, who is kept more in shadow, is in reality the greater villain. The description of Mr. Burton when he comes to the house of the painter, Robert Drummond, to induce him to put all his money into Rivers's Bank, then a failing concern, is in Mrs. Oliphant's best manner:—

The merchant suffered a little vexation to be visible in his smooth and genial aspect. He was a middle-aged man, with a bland aspect and full development, not fat but ample. He wore his whiskers long, and had an air that was always jovial and comfortable. The cleanness of the man was almost aggressive. He impressed upon you the fact that he not only had his bath every morning, but that his bath was constructed on the newest principles, with water-pipes which wandered through all the house. He wore buff waistcoats and light trousers, and the easiest of overcoats. His watch-chain was worthy of him, and so were the heavy gold buttons at his sleeves. He looked and moved and spoke like wealth, with a roll in his voice which is only attainable in business, and when business goes very well with you.

In the grasp of such a man, so plausible, so self-controlled when his own interests are at stake, so rich, so respectable, a dreamy, unbusinesslike, unpractical artist is necessarily as clay in the hands of the potter. Accordingly, when, with very little real reflection, Robert undertakes to become a partner in Rivers's, and to risk every penny he possesses on the bare word of his wife's prosperous cousin, the reader knows instinctively that it is a game of fox and goose, where the well-to-do City merchant is by no means the latter. No other indication is given of the state of affairs than Burton's "drawing a slightly long breath" when Robert consents to become a partner and director—that is, to bring so much money into the concern for a little longer factitious floating. Yet, scoundrel as Mr. Burton is, even he has his shadowy scruples of conscience when poor paralysed Stephen Haldane, the former minister of the denomination whereof Mr. Baldwin is the lay bishop, proposes to put all his little treasure too into Rivers's; that is, to reduce himself, his mother, and his sister to certain beggary. The whole scene is good and true, delicately indicated, and in no way exaggerated. Mrs. Oliphant does not describe those melodramatic starts and spasms and palenesses which would make the densest person suspect that evil things were brewing. Her work is too quiet and too well kept down for grimacing. Thus, just as the only sign of danger when Drummond joins the sinking ship is in that slightly longer breath which Burton draws, so, when he shrinks from the cruel responsibility of Stephen Haldane's ruin, the only hint he gives is to counsel him to think the matter well over before he decides, and to be quite sure that what he does is with his eyes open to the risks. This kind of suggestive writing is far more interesting than the minute details of motives, thoughts, and feelings which so many authors, and Mrs. Oliphant herself too often, adopt as their mode of narration. It tells enough to awaken the perceptions, while it leaves just so much to the imagination as stimulates the interest, and allows of shrewd guessing.

Of course the crash comes, and Rivers's Bank goes the way of the doomed. The interest of this part of the book turns on the fact that the other City scoundrel, Golden, contrives to make Drummond, who is only an unbusiness-like artist, take just so

\* *At His Gates*. A Novel. By Mrs. Oliphant, Author of "Chronicles of Carlingford," &c., &c. 3 vols. London: Tinsley Brothers.



much of the apparent management of things as shall give a colour to the accusations of dishonest dealing which have to come afterwards. But Mrs. Oliphant is not so well versed in business details as some other of our lady writers—Mrs. Riddell, for instance; and she makes rather a mess of Rivers's. A few sharp touches, laid on by an understanding hand, would have brought out the story of the failure and Drummond's mock responsibility and complicity more clearly than we have it now; but the author has evidently dealt with a subject unfamiliar to her, and the result is a certain woolliness of treatment not conducive to the briskness of the plot. The failure is followed by a point of still greater interest—Robert Drummond's suicide—with the doubt which the reader has whether he is really dead or not. There seems but little chance for a man who has gone overboard of his own accord in the middle of the Thames on a dark night; but though Mrs. Oliphant has managed this part of her story with admirable skill and reticence, betraying nothing, and giving no kind of hint, yet one cannot but feel that the obliteration of the poor weak artist is too sudden, too entire, and that a miracle has to be worked to bring him back to life before the last page is turned. As indeed it proves. Pending this return of Robert, or the confirmation of his death, the reader is taken up with the loves of Norah, Robert's only child, and the misfortunes of his old enemies the Burtons, "at whose gates" live the wife-widow with her daughter, as well as the Haldanes, who also were ruined by the failure of Rivers's. Partly from ostentatious kindness, partly from the revengeful kind of pleasure which a rich and formerly rejected suitor would naturally feel in holding out the hand of charity to the woman who had refused him, partly too from such hidden conscience as might be found after much seeking lying amidst his wealth, the wealthy Mr. Burton gives the Gate-house, which stands at the entrance to his grounds, to his ruined cousin Helen Drummond and his ruined friend the minister, Stephen Haldane. The contrast between the puffed-out prosperity, the showy equipage, the grand manner of living up at Dura, the salutations which he throws to the dependents on his bounty at his gates, "such as a jocund monarch might have tossed at a humble worshipper, mock ceremony, and conscious condescension," and Helen's confused memory and tenacious distrust is told in Mrs. Oliphant's best manner. But though we can understand the obligation under which both she and the Haldanes found themselves to take what they could get in times which gave them so little at the best, yet for all that it comes upon us with a certain sense of unfitness, if not quite of ingratitude, when Stephen says, "I wonder if he is comfortable when he reflects who are living at his gates!" in a "tone which was almost fierce in its self-restraint," and when Helen herself never relaxes in her smothered wrath. We almost wish that they had sought their fortune elsewhere, even if in so much greater poverty as it would necessarily have been; or that, in accepting the "jocund monarch's" bounty, they had accepted it simply, and without any lurking distrust at all. It affords, however, a good opportunity for displaying Helen's innate nobleness of nature when the crash comes, and she has the fortunes of one of her husband's traducers and (apparent) moral murderers in her hand. Instead of revenging herself then, as a meaner woman would have done, she helps him to escape; but we think the repetition of the incident in France a mistake; and we further doubt whether if any man, even a sentimental artist, with such wrongs to forgive on his own account, and the faintest glimmer of a legal conscience, would have been so tender-hearted as Robert Drummond. The finest dramatic bit in the whole story is when Helen, feverish, yearning, vaguely conscious of something waiting for her at home, leaves the ball at Dura which Clara gives on the eve of their ruin, and goes down to the Gate-house, really expecting to meet her husband of whose existence she is now sure, owing to a picture in the Exhibition the original sketch of which she holds. She finds instead only her cousin, concealed in her rooms like a malefactor, cold, hungry, and hunted, with the police waiting for him on the outside. The reader is as unprepared for the surprise as was Helen; and the effect is masterly. It throws into the shade the fact of Robert's reappearance when it comes; for which comparative tameness we suppose Mrs. Oliphant made her calculations, great points being only attainable by the sacrifice of smaller interests.

The characters of Helen Drummond and Clara Burton are the most finished of all in the book. Helen, with her lofty if somewhat vague aspirations, her clear perception of her husband's inability to fulfil her ideal, her weary acceptance of his artistic mediocrity, and the pain which his innocent self-complacency caused her, yet her hearty love and wifely devotion for him personally, makes a charming picture. Her temper is not always as smooth as it might have been, because her ambition and her critical faculties are ever at war with her affection; but when that affection alone is called out, and her sorrowful conviction that neither Francesca nor any other picture from her husband's hand has or will have a soul is thrust on one side, no one can surpass her in the wholeness of her devotion, the passionateness of her self-dedication to his memory. Clara Burton is a very different character; less beautiful, but more original. Unloving yet not cruel, cynical but not bad, dissecting the motives of every one about her and finding the core of each action, the pivot of each life, to be selfishness, brave to stoicism in the hour of ruin, and not without a certain contemptuous, half-indolent kindness in her hour of sunshine, she is both lifelike and unhackneyed. We question, however, the naturalness of her action towards Norah at all times,

and especially towards her in relation with Cecil Rivers. Such a cold little philosopher as she was would scarcely have schemed as she did either for her daughter or against Norah. It was more in accordance with her character to sit still and look on, laughing at them all in her sleeve, and reckoning them up as fools and self-seekers revealed only to her. To be sure she liked power, and to be the secret wire-puller of her living puppets; but we do not quite see into the wisdom of her proceedings with respect to Norah, Ned, and Cecil; and as things did not turn out as she would have had them, we think Mrs. Oliphant would have done better to have left her primary character of cynical philosopher and unimpassioned observer untouched. Nor do we like Dr. Maurice's offer to Helen, whom he does not love, for the sake of Norah, whom he does. We fancy the first idea was to make him confessedly in love with Norah, and by an afterthought only was this love toned down to such a simply paternal affection as to make a marriage with her mother its best mode of expression. The book suffers a little from want of concentration of interest; from the necessity of filling so much space month by month, and the consequent spinning out of the story, inherent in its serial form of publication; and also from a certain vagueness of treatment that looks as if it had been written under pressure. Nevertheless it is pleasant, bright, and tenderly touched, and will deservedly help the author's fame more than one step onward.

We have received a letter from Messrs. ALLAN BROTHERS & Co. of Liverpool with reference to the article entitled "Horrors of the Sea" which appeared in the SATURDAY REVIEW of the 9th instant. Messrs. ALLAN BROTHERS & Co. consider that the description contained in that article of the treatment said to be too often experienced by emigrants to America on the outward voyage must have been intended to refer to the ships of their Canadian line. We most willingly state that no such reference was intended. The article consisted of general comment on statements which had appeared in other journals, and had no reference to any particular firm; nor did it exclusively or specially refer to emigrants to British North America. The recent letter of Messrs. ALLAN BROTHERS & Co. to the TIMES on the subject of the Canadian emigration trade as conducted by them was, in fact, present to the mind of the writer when mention was made of "honest and liberal firms" who "would come out of it [i.e. a searching Government inquiry] with enhanced credit." We think it right to add that, from published materials which Messrs. ALLAN BROTHERS & Co. have brought under our notice, we should learn with surprise that, whatever foundation may exist for the complaints lately made of the ill-treatment of emigrants, those complaints had any application to ships owned by their firm.

## NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected communications: and to this rule we can make no exception.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday Mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.

## THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 891, NOVEMBER 23, 1872:

Prussia and Germany.	M. Thiers and the Assembly.
Ministerial Designs on College Property.	Russian Policy in Central Asia.
The Police Mutiny.	Legal Education.
The Colonies.	Mr. Ayrton's Rules.
	Sanitary Officers.

Millionaires.

Mr. Froude's Confession.	Dinners in the Provinces.
Judicious Kicking.	The Wellington Essayists on Infantry Tactics.
Italian Rome.	Fire-Proof Buildings.
	Botting-Houses.
	The Crystal Palace Concerts.

Palgrave's Essays on Eastern Questions.

Foster's Life of Dickens.	Maudsley and Tuke on the Physiology of Mind.
Margaret of Anjou.	Clode on Military and Martial Law.
Prendergast's Mastery Series.	Murray's Herefordshire.
	At His Gates.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

## ADVERTISEMENTS.

MR. and MRS. GERMAN REED'S New and Original Entertainment, HAPPY ARCADIA, FIVE O'CLOCK TEA, and VERY CATCHING—Royal Gallery of Illustration, 14 Regent Street. Every Evening (except Saturday) at 8. Thursday and Saturday Afternoons at 3.—Admission 1s, 2s, 3s, and 5s.

**CRYSTAL PALACE.—PARTICULAR ATTRACTIONS.**

**THIS DAY AND NEXT WEEK.**  
 Saturday (November 23)—Eighteenth Saturday Concert at Three; Billiard Match at Five.  
 Tuesday—Opera, "Robin Hood," at Three.  
 Wednesday—Instrumental Concert at Four.  
 Thursday—Opera, "Mariana," at Three.  
 Saturday—Nineteenth Saturday Concert at Three; Billiard Match at Five.  
 The Fine Arts Courts and Collections, including the Picture Gallery (the Works on Sale), the Technological and Natural History Collections, all the various illustrations of Art, Science, and Nature, and the Gardens and Park always open. Music and Fountains daily.  
 Admission, Monday to Friday, 1s.; Saturdays, 2s. 6d. Guinea Season Tickets Free.

**CRYSTAL PALACE COMPANY'S SCHOOL OF ART, SCIENCE, AND LITERATURE.—THIRTEENTH SESSION.—PRACTICAL ENGINEERING CLASSES.**

**Principal—Mr. J. W. WILSON, Assoc. Inst. C.E.** The Committee of Directors have established these Classes for the purpose of affording to Students of Civil and Mechanical Engineering thorough Practical Instruction in the Elements of either Profession, so that they may become at once useful to employers, and be enabled to take advantage of opportunities offered to them during the time they are articulated.  
 Students will be taught Mechanical Drawing, Estimating and Calculating, Pattern-making, and constructing Machinery for the Market. Lectures on Theoretical and Practical Engineering will be delivered from time to time; Examinations will take place, and Certificates of Proficiency will be awarded.  
 Extensive Shops and Offices have been fitted with the best Engineering Machinery for the purposes of the Class. The Session will open on the 6th of January next.  
 Prospectuses can now be had on application in the Office of the School next the Reading-Room, where only can Pupils be inscribed.

By Order of the Committee,  
**F. K. J. SHENTON, Sup. Literary Department.**

**THE SOCIETY OF PAINTERS IN WATER-COLOURS.—THE ELEVENTH WINTER EXHIBITION OF SKETCHES AND STUDIES WILL OPEN ON Monday next, November 25, at their Gallery, 5 Pall Mall East. Admission, 1s.**

**ALFRED D. FRIPP, Secretary.**

**ELIJAH WALTON'S COLLECTION of New OIL and WATER-COLOUR PAINTINGS now ON VIEW at 4 Westminister Chambers, Victoria Street, Westminster. Open from Ten to Five. Admission, 1s.****DORÉ'S GREAT PICTURE of "CHRIST LEAVING the PRETORIUM," with "Triumph of Christianity," "Christian Martyrs," "Francesca da Rimini," "Neophyte," "Titania," &c., at the DORÉ GALLERY, 30 New Bond Street. Ten to Six. Admission, 1s.****THE ARUNDEL SOCIETY'S DRAWINGS AND PUBLICATIONS are Exhibited Free, daily.**

The Chromo-lithographs on Sale to the public include the Works of Fra Angelico, Perugino, Bazzi, Melozzo da Forlì, Raphael, Holbein, and others, at prices varying from 10s. to 40s.  
 Priced Lists sent, post-free, on application.

**TERMS OF MEMBERSHIP TO NEW MEMBERS.**

1. The payment of £1 is, as an entrance donation constitutes membership as an Associate.
2. Associate Members can purchase the publications at lower prices than the public.
3. Associates are admitted in order of priority to fill vacancies in the List of Annual Subscribers, as they occur each year.

31 Old Bond Street, London, W.

**F. W. MAYNARD, Secretary.**

**THE SCOTTISH CORPORATION.—H.R.H. the Prince of WALES and Duke of ROTHESAY, President.**

THE TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY FESTIVAL will take place in St. James's Hall, on St. Andrew's Day, November 30, when the Right Hon. ROBERT LOWE, M.P. (London University), LL.D. (Edinburgh), the Chancellor of the Exchequer, will occupy the Chair.

Those Noblemen and Gentlemen who have not yet replied to the Invitations sent to them are respectfully requested to do so at their earliest convenience.  
 Tickets for Ladies and Gentlemen for the Festival, for which early application ought to be made, may be had of the undersigned.  
 N.B.—As many Gentlemen as may find it convenient are respectfully requested to appear at the Festival in Kilts or Uniform.

**MACRAE MOIR.**

The Scottish Corporation Hall, Crane Court, E.C.  
 November 15, 1872.

**PROFESSOR T. HEWITT KEY'S COURSE OF LECTURES on "LANGUAGE, ITS ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT," at UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, London, will commence on Thursday, November 28, at Three o'clock, with an Introductory Lecture, open to the Public. Fee for the Course of Twenty-five Lectures, One Guinea.****TAUNTON COLLEGE SCHOOL.—A COUNCIL SCHOLARSHIP of £20 a Year, tenable at the School, will be offered to Competition early in December. For particulars apply to the HEAD-MASTER.****MALVERN COLLEGE.—There will be an EXAMINATION on Thursday, December 19, for Two Classical and One Mathematical Scholarships, value £20, for One or for Two Years. Also for a Military Class or other Exhibition, value £20.—For particulars apply to the HEAD-MASTER.****WOOLWICH, COOPER'S HILL, INDIAN CIVIL, ARMY, AND UNIVERSITIES.—Rev. Dr. HUGHES, Rector of Perivale, who has passed over 300 Pupils, has arranged with a late Officer of the Royal Artillery, educated at Eton and Woolwich, of equal experience with himself, residing at his Rectory, distant half-a-mile, to receive TWELVE YOUNG GENTLEMEN, from Twelve to Sixteen years of age, who will have the benefit of the same staff of Masters as his own young men preparing directly for their Examinations.—Castlebar Court and Perivale Rectory, Ealing, W.****EDUCATION in NICE, France.—PRIVATE PUPILS only.**

£150 per annum, to include all the usual extras.—Address, MESTON, 26 Villiers Street, Strand, London.

**WANTED, a Certificated MISTRESS for the CLEATOR MILL BRITISH SCHOOLS (Mixed). Particulars may be obtained on application from THOMAS AINSWORTH, Cleator Mills, Cleator, by Carnforth.****A YOUNG LADY, educated Abroad (Diplômée), desires an Engagement as RESIDENT GOVERNESS. Thorough French and Music. Elementary German, Singing, and English.—Address, H. I., Boddington's Library, Notting Hill, W.****APARTMENTS.—Comfortable Rooms are offered to One or Two GENTLEMEN in a private residence, near a Station on the Metropolitan Railway, in the W. district.—Apply to Mr. DEAR, 39 Southampton Street, Strand.****£6,000.—For this Sum the PROPRIETORSHIP of a Well-Established and Prosperous JOURNAL may be Purchased. The Proprietor may also be the Editor thereof, the Gentleman who now holds that post being about to accept a more lucrative position.—Address, in first instance, to S. T., Charing Cross Post Office.****REGENT STREET.—Important LEASEHOLD ESTATE, 15 Regent Street, Waterloo Place, held by a Lease for an Unexpired Term of 44 Years, at a Ground Rent of £33, will be SOLD by Auction, by Messrs. J. & R. KEMP, at the Mart, Tokenhouse Yard, London, on Tuesday, November 26, 1872, at Two o'clock precisely.—W. W. COMISS, Esq., Solicitor, 51 Great Portland Street, W.****ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY ACRES covered with Coniferæ.**

Ornamental Evergreens, and Deciduous Trees and Shrubs of the choicest sort, with Forest Trees, Fruit Trees, Rhododendrons, &c., &c., all in luxuriant growth at the HEATHERSIDE NURSERIES, BAGSHOT, SURREY, to which THOS. THORNTON invites the inspection of the Public and the Trade; the Grounds are laid out in avenues which, whilst presenting a good view of the Stock, afford an agreeable promenade, and enable Visitors to select their own Plants.

Estimates given and Contracts made for laying out and planting Parks, Public Grounds, Belts, Avenues, and Pleasure Grounds of all sizes. A fair discount for cash. The usual allowance to the Trade.  
 Catalogues and other information will be sent on application.  
 The nearest station is Farnborough, S. W. R., where conveyances can always be had.

**SEWAGE UTILIZATION.—The DIRECTORS of the NATIVE GUANO COMPANY, Limited, invite Town Authorities, Members of Local Boards, and others interested in the Utilization of Sewage and the Purification of Streams, to Visit the Works at Crowsnest (London Southern Outfall), or Leeds, and inspect the A.B.C. process now at work there.**

1 St. Swithin's Lane, E.C., October 1872.

**C. RAWSON, General Manager.**

**HYDROPATHY.—SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill.**

Physician—Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D., Edin. Turkish Baths, Consultations daily (Saturday excepted) at 7 Princes Street, Hanover Square, from Ten till Twelve.

**THE AGRA BANK, Limited.—Established in 1833.**

CAPITAL, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS LANE, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON.

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

Current Accounts are kept at the Head Office on the Terms commensurate with London Banks, and Interest allowed when the Credit Balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:—

At 5 per cent. per ann., subject to 12 months' Notice of Withdrawal.

For shorter periods Deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

Bills issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank, free of extra charge, and Approved Bills purchased or sent for collection.

Sales and Purchases effected in British and Foreign Securities, in East India Stock and Loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn, and Army, Navy, and Civil Pay and Pensions realized.

Every other description of Banking Business and Money Agency, British and Indian, transacted.

**J. THOMSON, Chairman.**

**PHENIX FIRE OFFICE, LOMBARD STREET AND CHANCERY CROSS, LONDON.—ESTABLISHED 1720.**

Prompt and Liberal Loss Settlements.

Insurance effected in all parts of the World.

**GEO. W. LOVELL, Secretary.**

**IMPERIAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.**

Established 1803.

1 OLD BROAD STREET, E.C., and 16 and 17 PALL MALL, S.W.

CAPITAL, £1,600,000. PAID UP AND INVESTED, £700,000.

**JAMES HOLLAND, Superintendent.**

**EAGLE INSURANCE COMPANY.**

Established 1807. (For Lives only.)

79 PALL MALL, LONDON.

Income from Premiums ..... £346,379

from Interest ..... 139,049

Accumulated Fund ..... 3,100,699

**FURTHER SECURITY.—A Subscribed Capital of more than £1,500,000.**

The Expenses of Management are under 3 per cent.

The Thirtieth Quinquennium terminated in August last. The portion of the Surplus then set aside for distribution amounted to £184,651, and is now in course of being allotted.

**GEORGE HUMPHREYS, Actuary and Secretary.**

**DIVIDENDS 5 and 10 to 20 PER CENT.—For Safe and Profitable Investments**

**Read SHARP'S INVESTMENT CIRCULAR (post free).**

Published Monthly (12 paces), now ready.

It contains all the best paying and safest Stock and Share Investments, with Market Prices, Reports, Dividends, &c. &c. Safe Investments in English and Foreign Railways, Debentures, Banks, Mines, Foreign Bonds, Telegraphs, Gas, Docks, American and Colonial Stocks, &c. CAPITALISTS, SHAREHOLDERS, INVESTORS, TRUSTEES, will find this Investment Circular a safe, valuable, and reliable Guide.

Messrs. SHARP & CO., Stock and Share Brokers, 33 Poultry, London, E.C. (Established 1844).

**SEASON 1872-73.****NICE.—For TARIFF of the HOTEL des ANGLAIS—the new first-class Hotel facing the Sea and under English management—address THE SECRETARY, Mediterranean Hotel Company, Limited, 80 Coleman Street, London, E.C., or to the Hotel, Nice.****BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.—Every endeavour is made to render this Hotel equal to its long-existing repute. Spacious Coffee Room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Bureau of Service in the Hotel.—Communications to the MANAGER, Bedford Hotel Company, Limited.****WINTER SEASON.—GRANVILLE HOTEL, St. Lawrence-on-Sea, Thanet.—During the Winter Months a Reduction of 25 per cent. will be made upon Apartments, Board, &c. per week; Apartments according to size and position; Attendance, 1s. a day. Hydropathic, Turkish, or one and every description of Baths in the Hotel. Table-d'hôte at 6.30 P.M.****E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand, W.C., and 34 Royal Exchange, E.C.**

Manufacturers of CHRONOMETERS, WATCHES, ASTRONOMICAL HOUSES, and TURRET CLOCKS, to Her Majesty, and H.R.H. the Prince of Wales; Makers of the Great Clock of the Houses of Parliament, and of the New Standard Clock of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich. Catalogues on application.

E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand, 31 and 32 Royal Exchange (adjoining Lloyd's), and the Factory, Savoy Street, Strand, London.

**ALUMINIUM WATCHES, £1 1s., £1 10s., £1 15s., £2 2s.**

Marvellous Timekeepers. Machine made. Same as supplied by us to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales. Illustrations Three Shillings.—MILLIN & LAWLEY, 108 Strand.

**FENDERS, STOVES, KITCHEN RANGES, FIRE-IRONS, and CHIMNEY-PIECES.—Buyers of the above are requested, before finally deciding, to visit the SHOW-ROOMS. They contain such an assortment of Fenders, Stoves, Ranges, Chimney-pieces, Fire-irons, and General Ironmongery as cannot be approached elsewhere, either for variety, novelty, beauty of design, or exactness of workmanship, or price.**

Black Register Stoves ..... from 9s. 9d. to 25s. 6d.  
 Bright ditto, with Ornamented Fronts ..... from 23 12s. to 43 10s.  
 Bronze Fenders ..... from 4s. to 25 12s.  
 Steel and Ornamented Fenders ..... from 2 17s. to 23s.  
 Chimney-pieces ..... from 21 10s. to 42s.  
 Fire-irons (Set of Three) ..... from 4s. to 25 12s.

**COAL SCOOPS.—WILLIAM S. BURTON has 400 different**

Patterns of COAL SCOOPS on SHOW, of which he invites inspection. The Prices vary from 2s. 4d. to 15s. Plain Black open SHOW, from 2s. 4d. to 10s. 6d., zinc-lined, from 2s. 4d. to 10s. 6d.; ditto, with Hand-Scrap, from 12s. 6d. to 15s. 6d.; do. do., with fancy ornamentation, from 14s. 1s. highly finished and ornamented, and fitted with imitation ivory handles, from 22s. to 150s. There is also a choice selection of Wooden Coal Boxes, with iron and brass mountings.

WILLIAM S. BURTON, General Furnishing Ironmonger, by appointment, to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, sends a CATALOGUE, containing upwards of 800 Illustrations of his unrivalled Stock, with Lists of Prices and Plans of the 30 large Show-rooms, post free, 39 Oxford Street, W.; 1, 1A, 2, 3, and 4 Newman Street; 4, 5, and 6 Perry's Place; and 1 Newman Yard, London, W. The Cost of delivering Goods to the most distant parts of the United Kingdom by Railway is trifling. WILLIAM S. BURTON will always undertake delivery at a small fixed rate.

**CLARK'S PATENT STEEL SHUTTERS, Self-Closing.**

Fire and Thief Proof, can be adapted to any Window or other Opening. Properties free.—CLARK & CO., Sole Patentees, Rathbone Place, W.; Paris, Manchester, Liverpool, and Dublin.

**STAINED GLASS WINDOWS and CHURCH DECORATIONS.—HEATON, BUTLER, & BAYNE, Garrick Street, Covent Garden. Prize Medal, London and Paris.****WOOD TAPESTRY DECORATIONS.—HOWARD'S**

PATENT.—Wood Tapestry can be applied to all even surfaces, being an adaptation of real wood, in lieu of painting or paper hanging, being beautiful in effect and exceedingly durable.

**HOWARD & SONS,**

Decorators, Upholders, and Patent Parquet Flooring Manufacturers, 25, 26, & 27 Berners Street, London, W.

**SANITARY.—DR. ALFRED CARPENTER'S SYSTEM of**

re-arranging DRAINS and WATER-PIPES carried out. Self-evident that it is the only plan that can be effectual.—F. FRESHWATER, Builder, 71A Kensington Park Road, Notting Hill.

**BURN the "STAR" NIGHT LIGHTS,**

For Safety, Economy, and Regularity. Six, Eight, and Ten Hours.

Sold Everywhere.

**COLD CREAM OF ROSES.**

In Jars, 1s.

PIESSE & LUBIN prepare this exquisite Cosmetic with the greatest care, fresh daily. Cold Cream Soap, free from alkali, 2s. per lb. Sold by all fashionable Druggists and Perfumers. Ask for PIESSE & LUBIN'S manufactures to prevent disappointment.—Laboratory of Flowers, 2 New Bond Street, London.

**IRON WINE BINS.—W. & J. BURROW, MALVERN.**

The original Inventors and Patentees of the "Safety" Wine Bins, with elegant rest for each bottle. All sizes and shapes.

Illustrated Price Lists free